FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 028 11 February 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Vorontsov: 'Ball in U.S. Court' at Geneva AA 1
TV on Talks' Progress AA 2
Weapons Testing Talks Break, To Resume AA 3
Petrosyants Deplores U.S. Line AA 3
Bogachev: U.S. 'Absurd Logic' AA 4
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Denies Submarines Breach SALT [Ponomarev, 30 Jan] AA 5
Further on 'Alternatives' News Conference [Ivanko, Charodeyev in IZVESTIYA 6 Feb] AA 7

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds Weekly News Conference CC 1
Enactment of New IAEA Rule CC 1
U.S. Stand on ABM Treaty CC 1
Criminal Code Revision CC 1
CSCE Progress CC 2
PRAVDA on Plenum Reactions, Socialism's Progress [Korionov, 6 Feb] CC 3
IZVESTIYA on Soviet, Western Rights Records [6 Feb] CC 5
Lomeyko, Kravtsov Address Rights Commission CC 7
Lomeyko on Israel, Palestinians CC 7
Apartheid; Mercenaries [Shishlo] CC 8
Kravtsov on Soviet Approach [Shishlo] CC 9
NOVOYE VREMYA Urges World Antiterrorism Effort CC 10
U.S. Blocks Agreement on Combating 'Mercenarism' [Shabayev] CC 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Delegation on 'Glasnost', 'Crossroads' A 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Calls NSC Report 'Anticommunist' [5 Feb] A 1
Bovin: U.S. Using Pressure of Dollar's Fall [IZVESTIYA 5 Feb] A 2
New CIA Director Faces 'Impossible Task' A 4
U.S. Channel Shows Moscow TV Opposite 'Amerika' A 5

CHINA

IZVESTIYA Reports Increased PRC Border Trade [Savenkov, 4 Feb] B 1
Freightcars Contract [IZVESTIYA 7 Feb] B 1
Permanent Shipping Offices in Odessa, Shanghai B 1
Activists Meet Chinese Students in Moscow 5 Feb B 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Ambassador, Former Envoy to FRG Interviewed G 1
Kvitsinskiy Grants Interview [Bonn GENERAL-ANZEIGER 7 Feb] G 1
Former Envoy Falin Interviewed [Bonn DIE WELT 10 Feb] G 4
10,000 Turks To Help With Construction Work [cross-reference] G 10

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Belyayev Views Mideast Scene, Egyptian Relations H 1
[London AL-TADAMUN 31 Jan]
Israeli Communist Party Plenum Meets 6-7 Feb H 4

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

MOSCOW NEWS Rebuts Charge of 'Political Errors' R 1
[Yakovlev, No 6, 8 Feb]
Burlatskiy Discusses 'Perestroyka,' 'Glasnost' R 4
[London AL-HAWADITH 6 Feb]
Yakovlev Interviewed by TRYBUNA LUDU Reporters R 9
[Warsaw, 5 Feb]
Chief Editor Afanasyev Describes PRAVDA Operations R 13
[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 30 Jan]
Nikonov Addresses Meeting of Kirov Voters R 15
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Feb]
IZVESTIYA Spotlights 'Web' of Kazakh Corruption R 20
[Shchepotkin, 24 Jan]
Multi-candidates Answer for 'Secret Balloting' R 26
[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

'Unexpected' Views on Construction Phone-In S 1
[Voznenskiy, Batalin, Serov, Melnikov, Reshetilov, Travkin]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Continuing Reportage on Launch of Soyuz TM-2 U 1
Cosmonauts Enter Station U 1
Day Two Aboard U 1
Spacecraft Mission Updated U 2
Cosmos-1819 Functioning 'Normally' 7 Feb U 2
Zholkver Contrasts U.S.-USSR Space Programs U 3
Communications Station Operates on Sakhalin U 3
[PRAVDA 6 Feb]

VORONTSOV: 'BALL IN U.S. COURT' AT GENEVA

LD031731 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 3 TASS -- The Soviet side has come for the current round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons with an open position of initiative, said Yuliy Vorontsov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR first deputy foreign minister, who heads the USSR delegation at these talks.

He spoke about the results of the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee that took place in Moscow 27-28 January. He stressed the plenum will occupy a special place in the implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress on the acceleration of the socio-economic development of Soviet society. The plenum determined specific steps aimed at the revolutionary transformations of all areas of Soviet life and making socialist development more dynamic. The Soviet people link their vital interests, the fate of the country and its international prestige with the restructuring and democratization being carried out by the party.

Yu. Vorontsov noted it was clear to every unbiased person the achievement of the creative aims we have set is only possible in conditions of peace and security. The whole enormous activity of the Soviet state in the international arena, its specific proposals and very important initiatives are aimed at ensuring a peaceful future for people -- and at eliminating the threat of war. Replying to journalists' questions about the state of affairs at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, Yu.M. Vorontsov, who heads the USSR delegation at these talks, said that at this round there are all the necessary prerequisites for consolidating Reykjavik's positive results. Wishing to end the deadlock at the talks, we proposed the Americans give up endless discussions in general terms and go to the specific coordination of the provisions of the framework understanding that would embrace all the directions at the talks -- a strengthening that would embrace all the directions at the talks -- a strengthening of the regime of the ABM Treaty, a cut in strategic offensive weapons down to their elimination by the end of 1996, elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, resolution of the question of the start of talks on the total prohibition of nuclear tests.

The measures in the said directions should be carried out, certainly, in a package, in their interconnection. Since the point at issue is to make a truly history-making step toward building a nuclear-freeworld free from the threats fraught in the appearance of strike weapons in outer space, Yuliy Vorontsov said.

Wishing to ensure progress at the talks, we expressed preparedness to carry out practical work for the coordination of the respective draft documents in each individual direction -- at the group on outer space, at the group on strategic offensive weapons and at the group attending to medium-range missiles.

At our first meeting in January with Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation, we reached understanding on precisely such an organization of work at this round. It must be said the first weeks have produced their results.

As a result of numerous intensive meetings at various levels within the framework of the delegations, progress has been made on a number of aspects in coordinating the wording to seal the results of Reykjavik.

Alarming points have, however, appeared in all three directions of the talks. So far the U.S. delegation adheres, as a matter of fact, to its old positions which do not allow progress on a number of key issues. Moreover the U.S. side is introducing additional complicating elements into its approach.

There is an impression, and its has particularly increased in recent days that the hands of the U.S. delegation are clearly tied, that there are no powers from Washington for showing a constructive approach. This is apparently what is necessary to those in the United States who, trying to please the Pentagon, are stubbornly pursuing the policy of the deployment of SDI (and this is precisely what they in Washington are now talking about, having thrown aside the "intensive research" camouflage), of undermining the ABM Treaty, implementing large-scale programmes in the field of nuclear arms.

Such is, in a nutshell, the situation today. It cannot but be a source of concern, Yuliy Vorontsov said.

It may be asked how the Soviet side plans to act at the talks under these conditions? Our policy is clear -- it is spelled out in the Soviet program for the elimination of nuclear weapons of January 15 last year, in our platform put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev at Reykjavik. All of this remains in force. We intend to do further everything necessary to implement the Reykjavik decisions. But, as you see, the ball is in the court of the U.S. side, the Soviet representatives stressed. Yuliy Vorontsov then replied to many questions posed by correspondents.

TV on Talks' Progress

LD032311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Feb 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondent V. Dmitriyev video report]

[Text] A session of the Disarmament Conference opened in Geneva today. The most striking thing about the multilateral talks within the framework of the conference -- and there are participants from 40 states -- is the universal nature of the tasks which which requires urgent solution. These include preventing an arms race on earth and in space, banning nuclear weapons tests and eliminating nuclear and other types of mass-destruction weapons, including chemical weapons. The prospects for specific ways toward solving these tasks have been pointed out in the Soviet program of 15 January of last year, the immense significance of which is being stressed by many delegations. What is needed to move forward and to reach practical accords is a responsible approach and, at the same time, a rejection of narrow, mercenary objectives which some people here are putting forward and slowing down the work of the conference.

The majority of the delegations -- and it is perhaps here that the main point of the present session lies -- have realized the need to strive toward breaking out of the procedural quagmire as soon as possible and move on to a path of seeking constructive solutions to the whole complex of questions of disarmament.

Representatives of Mexico, the USSR, Britain, and other countries spoke today.

[Begin recording] [USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu. M. Vorontsov] We make no secret of the fact that the implementation of our plans, which have been determined by the party and congress and the January plenum of the CPSU Central Committee -- these are plans for the most important restructuring and the acceleration of the development of the whole of our country -- would be facilitated by a reduction in international tension and an end to the wasting of forces and assets on an arms race which is senseless and deadly dangerous for the whole of mankind. [end recording]

So the winter session has begun its work. Success, it is stressed here, depends on good will and the contribution of all the states participating in the conference.

WEAPONS TESTING TALKS BREAK, TO RESUME

Petrosyants Deplores U.S. Line

LD101950 Moscow TASS in Russian 1753 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 10 TASS -- The USSR and U.S. delegations participating in the bilateral talks on questions of ending nuclear tests have decided to make a working break and resume the current, fourth round, on March 16.

Addressing a news conference today, the head of the Soviet delegation Andranik Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy, said the round started in conditions when the Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts was extended a fifth time. The Soviet Union hoped, in common with peace-loving mankind, the U.S. Administration would, at last, revise its negative attitude to the moratorium. Yet the nuclear blast in the Nevada test range on February 3 shattered these hopes.

Even under these conditions, the preparedness of the USSR, expressed in the Soviet Government's statement of December 18, 1986, stays: If the U.S. ends nuclear tests, the USSR will be ready any day and month to halt, on the basis of reciprocity, the implementation of its program for such tests.

The Soviet Union's principled stand on the question of ending nuclear tests is clearly set out in the statement referred to, where it is again proposed to "begin full-scale talks on a total ban on nuclear tests without delay."

At such talks, the Soviet side is ready for a stage-by-stage resolution of that task, the introduction of intermediate restrictions on the number and yield of nuclear blasts, Andranik Petrosyants said. These measures should certainly be, in the first place, substantial, provide for a considerable lowering of the permitted yield of blasts and the number of tests a year, and, second, be of a truly intermediate, temporary character with guidelines set for the terms of transition to a total ban on nuclear tests.

Deplorably, this constructive approach does not meet with a response from the current U.S. Administration pursuing a tough line against curbing the nuclear weapon race. As a matter of fact, the U.S. delegation proposes that only one question be tabled at the talks -- ratification of the "threshold" treaties on condition of a change in their protocols regarding treaties on condition of a change in their protocols regarding control. The resolution of that question, from the positions announced in advance by the United States, is put forward as a preliminary condition for discussions on all other issues proposed by the Soviet delegation. Thus, the examination of the whole package of problems for a further limitation and, certainly, an end to nuclear tests is put off for an indefinite future.

What is more, progress toward further restrictions on nuclear tests and ending them completely is being hindered by a large number of preconditions linked with progress at the talks on nuclear and space weapons.

In conclusion, the head of the USSR delegation repeated that, despite the complexities, the Soviet side bases itself on the fundamental need to end nuclear weapons tests, and that it is ready for this reason to continue the joint quest for mutually acceptable resolution.

Bogachev: U.S. 'Absurd Logic'

LD101542 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev comments:

A break till March 16 was announced at Soviet-U.S. talks on the issue of ending nuclear testing. The talks have failed to produce any positive results due to the United States' categorical refusal even to discuss the issue of a ban on nuclear explosions, press reports say.

In Geneva the United States adheres to the stand that calls in question the sense of holding any discussions with it on nuclear tests.

The U.S. side was reproached, and rightly so, also in the past that sometimes at the talks it put the cart before the horse, displaying readiness to discuss secondary, technical matters while refusing to solve the crucial items on the agenda. Currently, however, U.S. Chief Negotiator Robert Barker went much farther than shifting accents and priorities in discussion. Following his announcement of the break at the talks, he stated that nuclear weapon tests could be halted only after these weapons were destroyed.

Going one better than medieval scholastics, Robert Barker actually contends that it is much more expedient to conduct discussions on ending tests of the already abolished weapons than to hold talks on banning the perfection of the current huge arsenals of weapons of mass destruction.

Certainly, nobody takes Robert Barker seriously. The trouble is not in the absurd logic of the head of the U.S. delegation.

The point is that this logic reflects the U.S. Administration's unwillingness to take if only one step towards arresting the arms race, towards delivering mankind of the threat of nuclear war.

The conclusion that the U.S. delegation arrived at the talks on ending nuclear weapon tests unprepared would be too mild an assessment of the U.S. stand. It is perfectly obvious that at the fourth round of the talks in Geneva Washington sabotages the solution of the issue of banning nuclear explosions.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA DENIES SUBMARINES BREACH SALT

PM011411 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jan 87 First Edition p 3

[Article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer M. Ponomarev under the rubric "International Observer Replies to Reader": On Submarines, SALT II, and Western Radio Voices"; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction and reader's letter]

[Text] Retired Captain D. Kharebava from Lvov has written to the editorial bureau. He says in particular:

"I have heard the Soviet Union has launched new nuclear submarines, including Typhoon-class SSBN's. Western radio voices are claiming that USSR has thereby violated the SALT II treaty by going beyond the limits it laid down. How true are these reports, how should one approach them?"

M. Ponomarev, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer, answers reader D. Kharebava.

Your letter, Comrade Kharebava, essentially asks three different questions: Has the Soviet Union produced new nuclear submarines, did this violate the SALT II treaty, and how accurate are Western radio broadcasts aimed at Soviet listeners. We will examine them in order.

Your first question can be answered in the affirmative. Yes, our country recently launched two nuclear submarines.

True, they have not been commissioned. They are still under construction and their sea trials have not yet been held. The naval ensign has not yet been hoisted over them.

As for the ruckus whipped up in the West over the appearance of Typhoon-class nuclear submarines in the Soviet Union and the accusations about an "impermissible increase in Soviet military potential," it will be apposite to recall the United States has already commissioned eight modern submarines of a similar class (the Ohio class for the Trident system) and a month ago launched the ninth -- the Tennessee. It is armed with highly accurate Trident 2 (D-5) missiles, each of which can carry up to 14 nuclear warheads. Yet these systems might not have been in the sides' arsenals of nuclear arms if Washington had adopted the Soviet proposal put forward several years ago to abandon a reciprocal basis construction of Typhoon-class submarines in the USSR and Ohio-class submarines in the United States.

That, in short, is the position with regard to your first question, Comrade Kharebava. Let us look at the second question. [paragraph continues]

First and foremost it is necessary to recall that the SALT II treaty places a summary limit of 1,320 on MIRVed strategic ballistic missile launchers and heavy bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles. Until recently both the United States and the USSR had adhered to this limit. Thus, the figures on the number of Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms that M.S. Gorbachev gave R. Reagan during the Reykjavik summit indicated that on 11 October 1986 the Soviet Union had 1,225 MIRVed ICBM and SSBN launchers and heavy bombers equipped with cruise missiles, while the United States had 1,317 such launchers, including 127 heavy bombers equipped with cruise missiles. President Reagan had no objections.

However, since then the United States has commissioned another five heavy bombers equipped with cruise missiles and exceeded the summary limit laid down by the SALT II treaty. This treaty, which is based on recognition by both sides of the principle of equality and identical security and provides for strategic stability, was thereby trampled by the U.S. side. In taking this step, the United States opened the floodgates for an unrestricted race in strategic nuclear arms, which cannot fail to lead to the exacerbation of rivalry in the military sphere.

How did the Soviet Union act in these complex conditions? Carefully weighing the political, military, and moral aspects of the situation, the Soviet leadership concluded that it was necessary to make additional efforts to save mankind from the threat of slipping down the road to strategic chaos. This position was set forth in the Soviet Government's 5 January 1987 statement. It stresses U.S. actions give the Soviet Union "every justification for considering itself released from its commitments under the 1972 Interim Agreement and the SALT II treaty." At the same time, the statement pointed out, the USSR believes there is still a possibility of stopping the dangerous development of events which the current U.S. Administration is provoking through its irresponsible actions. Taking into account the immense human importance of the question and the need to retain the main factor inhibiting a strategic arms race, the USSR is still refraining from exceeding the restrictions imposed by the SALT I agreement and the SALT II treaty.

The Soviet Union's decision has been approved and supported by the world public. The decision, the West German newspaper KIELER NACHRICHTEN wrote, "dovetails with the peaceful, positive concept of disarmament put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee... The Soviet Union's decision to adhere to the SALT II treaty for the time being is further proof that Moscow is really interested in arms reduction." And THE WASHINGTON POST pointed out: "The Reagan administration's decision to violate an important limit with regard to SALT has produced an insignificant military gain which will cost us dear... Washington, not Moscow, has been the first to violate existing agreements in the arms control sphere."

Alright, but how do things stand over the launch of the new Soviet nuclear submarines? As I have already said, they have yet to undergo sea trials. It is only then, according to the SALT II treaty, that their launchers are counted and included in the limits defined by that document. So there can be no question of any violations of SALT II by the Soviet Union. The USSR intends to continue carrying out its commitments with regard to the limits set by the treaty.

I think it is important, Comrade Kharebava, to stress once again an oft-repeated idea: The Soviet Union stakes no claim to greater security, but nor will it accept reduced security.

It will take every measure necessary to maintain military-strategic equilibrium with the United States and strengthen strategic stability.

In conclusion, a word about Western radio voices. Clearly, there is no special need to talk about the broadcasts of radio stations such as Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Through the traitors and renegades encamped in their apparatus these CIA offshoots produce a daily stream of slander against our country and the other socialist states and do not balk at any provocations. There is no need to discuss the accuracy of their broadcasts.

As for the Voice of America, Deutsche Welle, or, say, the BBC, which pride themselves on their objectivity, their broadcasts as a rule are a veritable cocktail of truth, half-truth, and deliberate disinformation. A good example is their assessment of the USSR's attitude to the SALT II treaty in connection with the launch of the new Soviet submarines. It is a fact these submarines were launched. But the claim that the SALT II treaty was violated can be left to the conscience of those who authored it; to their unclean conscience, to be blunt. [This article is accompanied by a strategic offensive arms table which was previously published on page AA 2 in the Arms Control & Disarmament section of the 21 January 1987 DAILY REPORT]

FURTHER ON 'ALTERNATIVES' NEWS CONFERENCE

PM051645 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Ivanko and G. Charodeyev report: "Through Disarmament to Development. Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] International cooperation in various spheres, disarmament and development, the creation of a World Space Organization and a world laboratory -- these and many other questions were at the focus of attention at the news conference on "Peaceful Alternatives to the Arms Race and Military Programs" held in Moscow 5 February.

The journalists were addressed by Academician Ye. M. Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economic and International Relations; Ye. P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Academician N.K. Kochetkov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Zelinskiy Institute of Organic Chemistry; V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; and G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, disarmament is not a goal in itself, it is not just a means for eliminating the military threat but also a method for channeling additional resources to facilitate the solution of increasingly acute global problems, V.F. Petrovskiy said in opening the news conference. This is precisely why the program for security through disarmament put forward by us on 15 January last year perceives the allocation of funds for the purpose of social and economic development as a measure to accompany agreements on curbing the arms race.

The Soviet Union welcomes the conference on the interconnection of disarmament and development scheduled for next August in New York. Our country submitted a proposal to the United Nations to set up an international fund for assistance to developing countries which would receive part of the funds saved through reductions of military expenditure.

In our view there are no spheres in the utilization of science and technology without real peaceful options.

International cooperation could be developed in literally all spheres of modern science. The only thing missing is to demonstrate in practice the advantages of dialogue and publicity over confrontation and exclusivity.

Replying to journalists' questions, Academician N.K. Kochetkov noted the destruction of stockpiles of chemical weapons is a direct ecological purification of our planet. Moreover, chemical disarmament offers very broad opportunities for the development of chemistry, especially in the spheres of medicine and agriculture, and would also release certain industrial capacities.

Another problem involves disarmament and development. As Academician Ye. M. Primakov noted, if the Soviet proposals outlined in the 15 January 1986 statement were to be adopted, savings by the end of the century would amount to 1 trillion dollars for the United States and 300 billion for West Europe. The USSR is prepared to hand over 10 percent of funds saved from military expenditures for assistance to developing countries. Developing countries are getting involved on an increasingly large scale in the arms race. They account for 18 percent of the world's military expenditures. Their reduction would substantially assist these countries' development.

Much attention was devoted at the news conference to the Soviet Union's reaction to the latest nuclear explosion conducted by the United States at the underground test site in Nevada 3 February. This is already the 25th explosion, V.F. Petrovskiy said. The Soviet Union perceived this action by Washington as a challenge to world public opinion. Despite this, however, we continue to believe in the potential of common sense and good will existing in the world, to believe in the affirmation of sensible principles in the political behavior of states.

Ye. P. Velikhov said at the news conference that current opinion in the West holds that SDI is the only way to advance the latest technological methods. We are prepared to dispute this. The USSR proposes that cooperation begins in the sphere of creating the "Tokamak" installation for thermonuclear fusion. A number of countries actively support us. This is just one of several projects offering so many opportunities for cooperation. Furthermore, many scientists are now worried by the question of destroying the unity of science, which is linked both with the deterioration of the international situation and with commercial and military secrets. Scientific cooperation is beginning to deteriorate. Consequently, a number of scientists have drawn the conclusion that it is possible to take a certain sector of science and make it completely open, thus creating an international laboratory as a scheme uniting various projects. For example, the creation of new types of irradiation, electromagnetic probes, and many others.

Other questions by Soviet and foreign journalists were also answered.

GERASIMOV HOLDS WEEKLY NEWS CONFERENCE

Enactment of New IAEA Rule

LD101700 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS -- The convention on the physical protection of nuclear material worked out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) came into effect on February 8, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today.

It is held in the Soviet Union that the coming into force of the convention and the joining of many states to it, particularly those that implement international transportation of nuclear material, will be promoting the ensurance of nuclear safety, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, will be one of the steps toward preventing nuclear terrorism in the framework of common efforts to combat international terrorism as a whole.

U.S. Stand on ABM Treaty

LD101524 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS -- A "broad" interpretation of the ABM Treaty is linked with the plans of the Reagan administration to embark, as soon as they are ready, on an early phasing-in of ABM defences components, Chief of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today.

He said the essence of a "broad" interpretation is that the treaty, allegedly, permits not only research, but also development, including testing, of anti-missile defense systems or their components of any type of basing, if they are based on new physical principles. Thus this manoeuvre of the U.S. Administration has the aim of justifying stepping up developments in the SDI framework.

Having abandoned the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaties, the United States now actually starts undermining the ABM treaty, Gerasimov said.

Criminal Code Revision

LD101445 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS -- "A process of reviewing a number of cases, particularly those pertaining to Article 70 (anti-Soviet propaganda) of the criminal code of the Russian Federation, is under way in the Soviet Union," Gennadiy Gerasimov, a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, said at a briefing here today.

"Many of those who were convicted under this article," he pointed out, "having petitioned for pardon. The petitions are being considered and satisfied by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. One hundred and forty people have been pardoned as of today."

In answer to numerous questions asked by Western journalists, the ministry's spokesman said that a commission consisting of representatives of various departments and the public is now studying possibilities for a revision of the text of fundamentals of criminal legislation and of the criminal code of the Russian Federation in the direction of mitigation. [Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 10 Feb report on the news conference adds "In their appeals they pledge to stop their anti-Soviet propaganda. The number of pardoned people will grow as this kind of appeal continues to be considered, Gennadiy Gerasimov said."]

CSCE Progress

LD101522 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow Febraury 10 TASS -- "An important stage of work has begun at the Vienna follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) participating states," Gennadiy Gerasimov, a spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at briefing here today.

"The participants in the meeting began to consider proposals aimed at strengthening security and cooperation in Europe."

"The Soviet Union regards the strengthening of security and real disarmament as one of the central directions of the CSCE process."

"We hold that the problem of reducing armed forces and conventional arms on a European scale should be considered on an all-European basis with the participation of all the 35 CSCE participating states."

"At any rate it would be unreasonable to fail to use the resources of neutral and non-aligned countries, bearing in mind the positive role which they played at the first stage of the Stockholm conference."

"Disconnecting this group of countries from the consideration of disarmament issues in Europe would undermine the very foundation of the CSCE process and would take out its kernel."

"We believe that the second stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe would be the most appropriate forum to consider the issue of reducing the armed forces and conventional arms. This is why we support the well-known Polish proposal on supplementing the mandate of the conference."

"The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are still prepared to consider other countries' disarmament proposals aimed at resolving the urgent task of lowering the level of military confrontation and building security in Europe. It is now of importance to act dynamically and flexibly, and not to drown the issue in protracted debates."

"Our stand does not rule it out that with a view to expediting a transition to practical consideration of the disarmament issue in Europe we are ready for any forms of work, including unofficial contacts, both bilateral ones and those within a broader circle," the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphasised.

PRAVDA ON PLENUM REACTIONS, SOCIALISM'S PROGRESS

PM091643 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[PRAVDA Political Observer Vitaliy Korionov article: "Socialism and Time"]

[Text] Man has always tried to glimpse the future through the veil of time. However, millions of people probably have never had such an acute sense of time as now, when countries and peoples are at a sharp turn in their historical development.

Great October, which roused enormous human masses to independent political creativity, pushed world history ahead, and with each new spiral it is gathering speed. In just a few decades a new social system -- the socialist system -- has become established once and for all on the planet. The imperialism's colonial system is a thing of the past. A coalition of peace, reason, and good will is forming on the planet to counter the imperialist "war party," and new political thinking that accords with the realities of the nuclear missile era is taking shape. Scientific and technical progress is developing rapidly, opening up immense opportunities for mankind but, at the same time, harboring invisible dangers to it.

In a short historical period, socialism has proved that it is a dynamic, developing, forward-looking system. At the same time, it has also become clear that its development does not happen smoothly or serenely. Socialism has to battle for each step forward, overcoming the fierce resistance of external enemies.

However, confrontation does not only happen on the international scene, socialism's progress also means a struggle between the old and the new and the overcoming of stagnation, distortions, and contradictions within the new society itself. Our enemies also see our weaknesses and pin on those weaknesses their hopes of, if not crushing socialism, at least rolling it back.

The old world, in the grip of a general crisis, does not intend to surrender its positions. It intends to hang on to them at all costs and still has considerable potential for doing so. Furthermore, its extreme adventurist faction, counting on "defending itself" against the onward march of history, is contemplating the use of nuclear missile weapons. Such schemes must be thwarted. However, the prime condition for this is socialism's might and its ability always to be equal to the demands of the century and not slacken the pace dictated by the inexorable development of life. In short, time deprives the builders of the new system of any chance to relax or succumb to complacency and self-satisfaction. As the poet said, "ever onward, chase the fleeting day like a wave of fire."

One method used by our class enemies is to try to depict Soviet society as "closed," ossified, and declining. That is why the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum aroused immense interest worldwide, since it irrefutably proved the groundlessness of these attempts.

"Purposefulness, consistency, principledness, and creative valor are the characteristics of the plenum's work," Czechoslovakia's RUDE PRAVO wrote. "It has set an example of the creative development of Leninism under modern conditions, an example of words and deeds. Leninism in action is how the activity of the CPSU leadership can be described. [paragraph continues]

"The example of the CPSU's theoretical and practical activity lies in the fact that it has led the gigantic struggle in a principled, courageous, and uncompromising way. The CPSU has also made discussions which may strengthen decisively socialism's positions not only in the USSR but worldwide."

A resolute appeal was heard from the rostrum of the January plenum for Leninist norms and principles of action, whose very essence is diametrically opposed to marking time, stagnation, and conservatism, to be fully restored in the party and throughout our society.

Here, too, our thoughts automatically turn to an important document of Lenin's -- the "Letter to the Congress." It was nearly the end of 1922. V.I. Lenin was seriously ill, but all his thoughts were of the historic destiny of the party and the motherland, which was surrounded by capitalism. Lenin was thinking about how to increase the party's strength and raise its leading role, which would "ease its struggle among hostile states, a struggle which, in my opinion, can and must greatly sharpen in the next few years." Lenin advised adopting "a number of changes in our political system." Calling for an intensive and daily struggle to assert socialist norms and principles of life, Lenin particularly drew attention to the need to have a salutary distrust of "any boastfulness, and so forth."

How clearly we can see fidelity to Lenin's advice in the January Central Committee Plenum documents! On rereading these documents, we cannot fail to recall Lenin's prophetic words: "...If we have no fear of bluntly stating even bitter and difficult truths, we will learn unfailingly and certainly to overcome absolutely any difficulties."

There is nothing surprising in the fact that our enemies are not gratified by socialism's successes. However, even when we make mistakes, they cannot conceal their annoyance at the fact that Communists are able to admit openly their mistakes, learn the necessary lessons from them, and formulate strategic decisions that make it possible to move forward with even more confidence. The ability of a revolutionary party -- especially if it is a ruling party -- to talk directly about its shortcomings and, at the same time, define ways of rectifying them is a sign of a strong party confident of itself and of the support of its people.

"A revolutionary is not someone who speaks in revolutionary phrases," M.S. Gorbachev said in his closing speech at the plenum, "but someone who is able to build the future and rouse the people and party for a long and stubborn struggle, noting every step forward and using it to find yet another foothold from which to take another, longer step." The line worked out by the January Plenum is precisely such a line.

Imperialist circles make no secret of their concern that our party and country are accelerating their progress in implementing the course of the 27th CPSU Congress. If the program proposed by the plenum ends in success, Britain's THE DAILY TELEGRAPH writes in an editorial, for instance, "the West will be faced with dangers. Success will lead to an intensification of the Soviet Union's confidence in its own strength and to a strengthening of the economy and the military structure...." "The West is lost in wonder," West Germany's NEUE RUHR-ZEITUNG gloomily states, "and the idle astrologers who discuss the Kremlin's future can be dismissed." This, it seems, is a rare occasion on which capitalism can accuse us of boosting unemployment in the Western countries....

V.I. Lenin noted that the new system has the strength of example. This strength is seen in the way socialist countries solve problems that capitalism was powerless to solve. [paragraph continues]

And the more successfully the USSR and the other fraternal countries accelerate and intensify their social development, the greater will be the magnetic force of socialism.

While the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum was defining the new wide-ranging creative plans for developing Soviet society, an old story was heard from Washington: The White House was again importunately imposing on its own country and on the U.S. NATO allies a sinister program for a further arms race, not only on earth but in space, too. The peoples compare these facts and draw the proper conclusions.

At a time when U.S. imperialism's aggressive policy is increasing the danger of nuclear war, the international aspect of the strength of the socialist example is particularly clear. The fact that the program -- unprecedented in its scale and aims -- to build a nuclear-free world and eliminate all mass destruction weaponry was put forward precisely by the world's first socialist state will live in the memories of generations of people.

Life confirms that socialism is in step with the times.

IZVESTIYA ON SOVIET, WESTERN RIGHTS RECORDS

PM061643 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[L. Vladimirov "International Notes": "A Honest Approach is Needed. How the West is Responding to the Soviet Union's Initiatives in the Humanitarian Sphere"]

[Text] A rapid and complex process of renewal is taking place in all spheres of Soviet society. One of the program tasks being implemented in line with the 27th CPSU Congress decisions is the process of improving socialist democracy, further widening citizens' involvement in running all the affairs of society, and safeguarding and enriching citizens' socioeconomic, political, and personal rights and the creation of ever more favorable conditions for and guarantees of their full implementation. This is not being done at anyone's suggestion or at the instigation of foreign protectors of others' rights and freedoms, who are setting records for hypocrisy and duplicity in that field.

The task arises out of an inner urge to improve our socialist society in accordance with the needs and interests of the entire Soviet people, whose will is expressed by the Communist Party.

The CPSU Central Committee January Plenum was a major event in our country's life, bringing to the fore a program for the further democratization of social relations and development of self-management. The actual implementation of our citizens' broad rights finishes off the anti-Soviet stereotypes that are widespread in the West regarding the alleged infringement of rights and freedoms.

The Soviet state and our society as a whole see the consistent democratization of all aspects of economic, political, and spiritual life as a very powerful lever in the activation of the economic and social processes of restructuring.

There is an international aspect to the problem as well -- that is, humanitarian cooperation in this sphere on the basis of states' voluntary commitments. [paragraph continues]

The attention paid by the Soviet side to this sphere is evident in the number of international agreements it has signed and ratified in that sphere, beginning with the most important of them: the international bill of human rights; in the measures to improve the relevant domestic legislation and bring it into line with USSR's international commitments; and, finally, in the fact that humanitarian cooperation has been proclaimed by our state to be an integral part of the entire complex of measures to strengthen international security. Questions of strengthening trust between states, increasing mutual respect, and instilling in the peoples the spirit of friendship and love of peace are part and parcel of the development of this cooperation.

The changes that have been taking place recently in our country have already begun to have a favorable effect on the state of affairs in humanitarian cooperation in the international arena.

Since the beginning of the year, matters dealing with our citizens' leaving for foreign parts for family reasons have been dealt with more efficiently on the basis of the addenda to the statute on entering the USSR and on leaving the USSR, and a number of former Soviet citizens who once left the USSR and realized their mistake have returned to the country. A humane decision was taken with regard to Academician Sakharov, who embarked on work in his specialty at a scientific institute on his return to Moscow. Other steps are being taken to implement the accords set out in the draft document, which was examined at the recent international conference in Bern on problems of contracts between people. They are being taken despite the fact that its adoption was frustrated by the U.S. delegation's obstructionist stance.

The CPSU Central Committee January Plenum confirmed the irrevocability of the process of deepening democracy that is taking place in our country. Socialism gives working people truly broad political and socioeconomic rights and personal freedoms. It is now a matter of revealing as fully as possible the humanitarian nature of our system, whereby people feel they are the makers and true masters of their own country. The Soviet Union's international prestige and its image as a state that is making a sincere and consistent contribution to the democratization and improvement of the entire system of modern international relations are closely linked to the plenum decisions.

Now the question of the West's perception of the development of democracy in our country. There is a slight embarrassment there, caused both by the USSR's first practical steps in the humanitarian sphere and the overall thrust of our plans and proposals. In these conditions, the old anti-Soviet propaganda stereotypes have obviously ceased to work, although they are still actively employed in the West . For instance, the other day the U.S. Senate, obviously out of habit, put forward another resolution urging the Soviet Union to observe internationally recognized norms in the human rights sphere, the very norms which the United States itself is not only failing to observe, but has not even signed, it did not sign precisely because existing legal practice in the United States directly contradicts these norms and obligations.

Indeed, the value of the splendid principles of freedom, equality, and fraternity, formally proclaimed and even zealously publicized in the United States, becomes clear when you see the substantial evidence of freedom to die of cold in January frosts, equality in lines for charity soup, and the fraternity of staying in wretched flophouses on unemployment benefit.

In some parts of the West they have been quick to tune the state apparatus in such a way as to show themselves in a good light in the sphere of defense of human rights and, most importantly, to criticize others. What do you think French Secretary for Human Rights C. Malhuret is busy doing? [paragraph continues]

Preventing police violence against students and pupils in Paris and the racist atrocities being committed by ultra-rightists against French people with dark complexions? Maybe ensuring that three Soviet children detained in France illegally and without any consideration for their humanitarian rights are returned home soon to their parents? No, Monsieur Malhuret prefers to preach to the other states at the Vienna meeting and publicizes his own illegal crossing of the border of sovereign Afghanistan and participation in the increasingly infrequent demonstrations outside socialist countries' embassies.

One discerns yet another line of "humanitarian defense" by the Western countries, above all the United States. As soon as the USSR shows a sincere willingness to look into mutual, often complicated matters concerning mixed families and marriages and visits by relatives -- in short, takes constructive steps forward in the highly sensitive sphere of humanitarian contacts, which are of such great concern to the West -- the Western press and statesmen immediately start almost panicking about a "propaganda offensive," about "backward steps," and so on. But, in fact, this racket is intended to conceal the Western powers' hypocritical stance on human rights questions, because this topic, stripped of its shell of demagogic accusations against the socialist countries, immediately loses its political value to the West.

Here is a specific example: The USSR has proposed convening a conference on humanitarian questions in Moscow in order to exchange views calmly and without confrontation on the way international commitments on questions of exchanges between people and development of cooperation in the sphere of education, information, and culture are being fulfilled and to discuss what else could be envisaged in that sphere. Many people reacted in a realistic and appreciative manner to the proposal. Others, including some extremely well-known Western figures and activists from various rights campaigns directed against the socialist countries, heard alarms ring and demanded that the Soviet Union virtually pay a "political price" for the "right" to hold this conference in Moscow. Such attempts to speculate on the topical and important theme of humanitarian contacts are bound to devalue the solemn assurances of dedication to the ideals of human rights which many Western politicans regularly give.

The object of the Soviet initiative is to improve the situation in the countries involved in the all-European process in the humanitarian sphere. But it should be clear that this cooperation among states with different social systems is possible only if it is free from the disease of hypocrisy, from the imposition of one's own tastes and ways on others.

For our part, we have no intention of forcing our ideals and the spiritual values of our socialist society, which has existed for 7 decades, onto others. Mutual understanding, which would make it possible to improve activity in the humanitarian sphere, is perfectly feasible. But it requires an honest approach and goodwill.

LOMEYKO, KRAVTSOV ADDRESS RIGHTS COMMISSION

Lomeyko on Israel, Palestinians

LD062017 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1509 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva, Feb 6 (TASS) -- The participants in the session of the Human Rights Commission, which is taking place here, continue their discussion of the violation of human rights in the Arab territories occupied by Israel.

Speaking on this agenda issue today, USSR Spokesman V.B Lomeyko noted that the question of the violation of human rights in the occupied Arab territories, Palestine among them, concern every man on earth irrespective of his likes and dislikes, for the simple reason that we are living in an integral and interdependent world.

We are all suffering from violence, which is eating away international stability and security. The explosive conflict situation in the Near East exposes with particular accuteness the interdependency of all the factors of international security: military, political, economic, humanitarian ones, and, above all, including human rights. They are trying to instill in us, the speaker stressed, the idea that it is impossible to attain justice under conditions of wartime, because wartime itself dictates repressive measures. But this is the logic of all conquerers: they use violence to break into your home and then they complain that they encounter resistance.

We are told that it is the Israeli extremists that are against the existence of Arab Palestine, but this is not the policy of the Israeli Government. Are the extremists not the children of their state? Is not the state of Israel that has invaded and is holding Arab lands by force? Who is spreading militarized settlements by force? It is not the military governor of the West Bank of the Jordon River and Gaza Strip that has given the Israeli security body absolute authority to arrest any Arab?

The world community does not question the existence of the state of Israel, but there are people inside and outside of Israel who deny a similar right to the Arab people of Palestine. Israel must stop annexation and must carry out the UN decision to set up an independent Palestinian state. An important step has been made in the UN toward settling the situation in the Near East and thus toward eliminating the violation of human rights in this region. The General Assembly has confirmed that the convening of an international conference on the Near East is necessary.

The USSR delegation, decisively condemning the systematic and mass violation of human rights and freedoms in occupied Arab territories, believes that only the comprehensive settling of the situation in the Near East can put an end to the mass and crude violation of human rights in this region. This, above all, presupposes that Israeli troops should be withdrawn from the occupied Arab territories and the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to set up its own state, should be ensured. The human rights commission could make its own contribution to resolving this problem by supporting the measures undertaken in this direction, the USSR spokesman concluded.

Apartheid; Mercenaries

LD091823 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo reports:

The violation of the rights of peoples to self-determination is incompatible with the U.N. Charter and creates a threat to peace and security in various parts of the world, said Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the USSR delegation. He was addressing today the 43rd session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, whose participants are continuing the debate on the issue of the right of peoples to self-determination and its application to the peoples under colonial or foreign rule.

The Soviet representative pointed out the need for the international community to put an end to the disgraceful apartheid system in the south of the African Continent and also declared for the exercise of the right of the Namibian and Palestinian people to self-determination.

Touching upon the new dangerous form of violation of the rights of peoples to self-determination, which is linked with the attempts at forcibly changing, with the assistance of an army of "mercenaries," of the political and social development of a whole number of independent developing countries, in particular, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Mozambique, Angola, Kampuchea and Ethiopia, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed that such practices constitute crude interference in the home affairs of the above-said countries. The speaker drew attention to the hostile actions directed against socialist Cuba, a freedom-loving and independent state, a respected participant in the Non-Aligned Movement.

Le Dinh Kan, an observer from Vietnam, has condemned the crimes of the South African racists and the Israeli aggressors depriving the peoples of the Republic of South Africa, Namibia and Palestine of the right to self-determination and independence, and touched upon the situation around Kampuchea. Some representatives at the session were talking much about the need for the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea. Yet no one of them mentioned the aid which was given and is being given to the Pol Pot gangs who killed millions of Kampucheans during his four-year rule. Nobody recalls that now, and the "Khmer Rouge" organization is viewed by certain circles as a "defender" of the interests of the Kampuchean people, which is a crude distortion of the real state of things.

In that connection, the observer from Vietnam stressed, we welcome the proposal of the Australian prime minister who advanced the idea of setting up an international tribunal to try the Pol Pot criminals.

Kravtsov on Soviet Approach

LD052136 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 5 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo reports:

Guaranteed basic human rights and freedoms are considered in the Soviet Union among the basic goals of social, economic and political development, Soviet Justice Minister Boris Kravtsov said in his address to the participants in the 43d session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission today.

The January plenum meeting of the CPSU Central Committee discussed a number of issues of exceptional importance to our country, including those immediately related to political, civil and other human rights. We admitted honestly and openly, without false shame, that life should be viewed in its entirety and complexity. Even most remarkable achievements should not obscure contradictions in societal development or our own mistakes and failings.

The plenary meeting admitted that negative processes had badly affected the social sphere and outlined the broad range of concrete measures to rectify the situation.

What all they amount to is the further development of democracy. We proceed from the belief, the Soviet justice minister said, that it is only through the consistent development of democratic forms and the broadening of self-government that we can advance in production, science, technology, literature, culture and the arts, in every sphere of social life. The country has outlined a vast program to revise legislation so as to meet the needs of the further democratic development of Soviet society.

The Soviet Union is not slackening its efforts in the U.N. Human Rights Commission as it participates in international cooperation on human rights. The consistent fulfillment of the Soviet idea of establishing an all-embracing system of international security could give a fresh impetus to the further expansion of such cooperation. This system should embrace all the basic aspects, such as military, political, economic and humanitarian, the latter covering a broad spectrum of virtually all the issues of human rights.

The Soviet Union's constructive approach to the solution of humanitarian problems was manifest in its initiative, presented in Vienna, for convening a representative conference on the entire range of humanitarian problems in Moscow this year. It is a goodwill proposal, Kravtsov stressed: We are ready for an open discussion on this subject and hope that it will help dispel the totally unnecessary fog of misunderstanding which blankets some humanitarian problems.

NOVOYE VREMYA URGES WORLD ANTITERRORISM EFFORT

LD051756 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- Terrorism is a serious international and political problem now, the weekly NEW TIMES writes in its latest issue. Any terroristic action might complicate relations among states, if there is trustworthy information proving that it was masterminded or backed from abroad, or serious enough grounds to believe so. Relations among states might be aggravated still more, if the official authorities of one of the sides prove involved in terroristic actions.

At the same time, accusations of such an involvement can be absolutely groundless; moreover, they can be deliberately inspired or provoked.

The Reagan administration adopted from the very start the slogan of combatting international terrorism, and made it the pivot of its political-propaganda line in the world arena. There is a very influential group in the U.S. leadership which is convinced that terrorism must be answered by an outright use of military force. And it is possible to find many pretexts for the show of military strength.

Terrorism is a phenomenon of an international scale and a cowboy's dashing manners in combatting it are out of place. What is needed is a serious and purposeful effort of the entire world community, broad and versatile cooperation among states. The USSR is prepared for such work. And this must be done without delay. It must not be tolerated that criminal terroristic actions should take human lives, breed violence, cause a sharp aggravation of the situation, disrupt normal functioning of international and inter-state ties, undermine international security, the weekly writes.

U.S. BLOCKS AGREEMENT ON COMBATING 'MERCENARISM'

LD091653 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev;

The efforts of the majority of delegates of the Sixth Session of the United Nations ad hoc committee on the drafting of the international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries have not been crowned with success. The session has ended without achieving accord on a document which is called upon to become an important legal instrument for curbing the spread of mercenarism. Representatives of a number of Western powers, above all the United States, blocked agreements on such key provisions of the [words indistinct] discussed as the definition of the very notion of "mercenary". Nor do they wish clarity in the question as to who should be classed with persons engaged in recruitment, financing and use of mercenaries.

This obstructionist stand is not surprising for mercenaries now are not a handful of cutthroats [words indistinct] a strike force of imperialism, equipped with the latest armaments, having a ramified organization and trained in the most vicious methods of subversion and mass terror. This force is widely used to overthrow lawful governments, crush national liberation movements, destabilise the situation not only in separate countries but also in whole regions.

I am ashamed of what the United States is doing in Angola, this is how American Congressman R. Brown summed up his impressions of visiting Angola. What he saw there -- a multitude of orphans, people wounded by U.S. bombs and missiles -- reminded him of the picture of Vietnam torn by U.S. interventionists. The difference is that the intervention in the African country is implemented by the USA with the use of mercenaries -- gangs of terrorists headed by Savimbi. The CIA regularly supplies mercenaries with arms and equipment via the racist republic of South Africa and Camina Airbase in Zaire. The U.S. Congress appropriated 15 million dollars for these armaments in the past year.

100 million dollars is the sum to be spent by the USA on Nicaraguan Contras in the current fiscal year. The Reagan administration got from the Congress the appropriation for this sum for aid to its mercenaries fulfilling Washington's order: to end the Nicaraguan revolution and restore the pro-American puppet regime. Criticizing the President's budgetary priorities, another congressman, Tony Quello, emphasized that the White House wishes to increase financing for the Contras, while cutting by many billions of dollars the appropriations for relief to the hungry, homeless and unemployed in the United States.

Still higher are the rates which Afghan counterrevolutionaries are paid. Washington spares neither funds nor human lives in an effort to frustrate the process of national reconciliation started by Kabul. 600 million dollars was appropriated by the Reagan administration for aid to the Afghan counterrevolution in the current budget of the USA. The Reagan administration draws on these funds to send to counterrevolutionaries a new consignment of "Stinger" missiles that are used to down civilian aircraft.

Terrorism and mercenarism are synonyms in a political sense, and it is quite natural that those who profess and implement the policy of state terrorist are blocking international efforts aimed at cutting short and eliminating mercenarism.

U.S. DELEGATION ON 'GLASNOST', 'CROSSROADS'

LD101854 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 10 Feb 87

[Text] New York February 10 TASS -- Upon returning home, members of a group of prominent American politicians and public figures, who had met recently with General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin, expressed their assessments of Soviet-American relations and prospects in the sphere of disarmament.

"I think the Soviets are seriously interested in reaching an arms control agreement". This is how former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger commented on his impressions on the meeting in Moscow, when he appeared in the NBC television network's programme "Meet the Press". Kissinger holds the framework of the talks set in Reykjavik could be supplemented and that compromises could be achieved within that framework.

"I think that we are at a crossroads" in relations with the Soviet Union, former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance said in "Meet the Press" programme. He said he hoped the road leading to the improvement of these relations would be taken.

Another participant in the meeting in the Kremlin, member of the Council on Foreign Relations, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff David Jones was asked during an interview in "Today" programme of the NBC television network, if he returned home with a convinction that the Soviet Union really wishes to do business with the Reagan administration in the arms control question and has a serious attitude. He answered he believes the USSR wishes to conclude an agreement, but not of the kind when it will have to concede to what it would view as unjustifiable U.S. claims.

Expressing his viewpoint on the changes taking place in the Soviet Union, another member of the group, member of the Council of Foreign Relations, former U.S. Secretary of Commerce Peter Peterson said that apparently this is really new thinking. It is called reorganization in the Soviet Union and it means a radical reform. He said he believes it mainly consists of three aspects: first, to enable people to learn reality. One hears a great deal about glasnost or openness...It also means selfcriticism on a larger scale. It also includes democratisation, one might say, of elections, democratisation of industrial enterprises, including their management, a new system of stimulation, joint enterprises, giving an opportunity to workers to decide on the distribution of profits of enterprises. Thus vast changes are taking place. Peter Peterson is of the opinion that the course of the Soviet leadership at creating joint enterprises with foreign capital is of interest to the USA.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA CALLS NSC REPORT 'ANTICOMMUNIST'

PM051017 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Nothing New"]

[Text] Washington, 4 Feb -- The White House has published President Reagan's report to Congress on "U.S. strategy in the national security sphere." [paragraph continues]

This document, prepared by the National Security Council, is essentially the administration's program statement on its foreign and military policy aims for the next 2 years.

However, as a high-ranking administration representative acknowledged in conversation with journalists, there is "nothing new" in this report. Indeed, its 40 pages restate the U.S. intention to continue the old "position of strength" policy and the "crusade" against the forces of socialism and progress and the course of interference in sovereign states' affairs. The essence of the report's content, one correspondent remarked, can be expressed in a single word -- "anticommunism."

The White House openly proclaims the United States' main enemy is the Soviet Union, which, it is alleged, presents a "global threat" to U.S. security and national interests. Fundamental differences in economic, social, and political convictions and aims, the report says, are leading to essentially hostile relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The President proclaimed the administration's main foreign policy aims to be the further buildup of U.S. military might, the "guarantee of unhindered U.S. access to the oceans and to space," the strengthening of the military blocs and alliances with Washington's allies, and the intensification of the pressure on the Soviet Union by all the means available to Washington.

The White House intends to attain all these goals with the help of the tried and tested instruments of its policy -- military force, the blackmailing of sovereign states, the export of counterrevolution, and generous dollar sops to Washington's clients. America's "main priority" in the military sphere is the continuation of the program to "rearm America," begun by the Reagan administration with the modernization of the strategic offensive forces as its cornerstone. The prime tasks listed here include the deployment of first-strike MX and Trident-2 missiles and new strategic bombers and cruise missiles and the continued acceleration of the "Star Wars" program.

BOVIN: U.S. USING PRESSURE OF DOLLAR'S FALL

PM091315 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Dollar in Free Fall"]

[Text] If one permits oneself a certain levity in such a serious business as foreign exchange and financial relations and distances oneself from the actions of natural forces, then it can be said the Americans are manipulating the dollar exchange rate extremely skillfully. By exploiting the overvalued dollar rate in the first half of the eighties Washington managed to attract multibillion-dollar sums into the country from abroad. U.S. partners paid for the stabilization of the national economic situation in America by slowing their own economic growth. In the second half of the eighties, exploiting the depressed dollar rate, Washington is trying to improve the competitiveness of U.S. goods, boost exports, and thereby reduce its trade deficit. Once again the improvement in the U.S. economic position has to be paid for by a deterioration in the economic position of its main partners, which have been forced to reduce their exports and therefore the growth of the export sectors of their national economies as well.

Let us look at the figures. Last year the United States imported goods worth $387.1 billion. Total U.S. sales abroad were $217.3 billion. Thus, the excess of imports over exports -- that is, the trade deficit -- amounted to $169.8 billion ($58.6 billion of which was accounted for by Japan). In the previous 5 years overall the total deficit has amounted to $368.5 billion. This could not fail to cause a deterioration in the foreign economic position of the United States.

To cut the import-export gap, imports either must be restricted or exports increased, or both. The Reagan administration, despite all manner of wavering, is against wide-ranging protectionist measures. We are left with boosting exports. How? The present U.S. economy is incapable of markedly increasing the quality of its goods and thereby beating its main competitors. There is only one way -- selling more cheaply. that task is solved by the fall in the dollar exchange rate.

Let us try to imagine the corresponding mechanism by using a theoretical example. Suppose (I hope the Japanese will forgive me) that the dollar-yen rate was 1:1 -- that is, 1 dollar would buy Y1 and vice versa. Suppose further that a U.S. refrigerator costs 100 dollars and a Japanese transistor Y100. This means that a U.S. refrigerator would cost Y100 in Japan, and a Japanese transistor would cost $100 in the United States.

Now suppose the dollar halved in value. That is, 1 dollar would buy Y0.5 and Y1 would buy $2. It is not hard to work out that a U.S. refrigerator priced at $100 in the United States could be bought in Japan for just Y50. Other U.S. goods would correspondingly fall in price. The Japanese would buy more of them; U.S. exports to Japan would grow. The balance of trade would even out. QED.

Things would be much worse for the Japanese transistor in the U.S. market. Since Y1 buys $2, the price of a transistor would double to $200. Correspondingly, it would be much harder for the Japanese to sell their goods in the United States and Japanese imports would fall.

Let us return to the world of real relationships. In allowing the dollar to fall, Americans are counting on selling more and buying less. Increased exports -- that is, increased demand for U.S. goods -- should additionally stimulate U.S. economic growth.

That is to the United States' advantage. However, it is by no means to the advantage of countries whose economic development depends largely on exports (Japan or the FRG, say). For them a narrowing of markets means a slowing of economic growth. That is why a plummeting, free-falling dollar scares Bonn and Tokyo. They would like to see a "regulated," controlled reduction in the dollar -- or, even better, stable exchange rates. The Americans also say they favor "regulation" and "stability." In fact they are in no rush to slow the dollar's fall.

The free-falling dollar is being used by Washington as a means of pressuring its partners (and competitors). The aim of the pressure is a kind of transplantation of Reaganomics. People in Washington want to force the allies to run their economies in the way Washington prefers. They recommend domestic markets be stimulated (taxes and interest rates cut and defense spending increased) to make up for the reduced export opportunities.

The allies are hanging on as best they can. They are probably pinning their hopes less on the strength of their own opposition than on the fact that a weak falling dollar also hurts U.S. interests. First, such a dollar triggers a flow of capital out of the United States, or at any rate does not promote inflows of foreign capital. Second, the high cost of imports pushes up the general level of prices and fuels inflation. As a result of the difficulties in the U.S. economy will increase.

That should theoretically be the case. In practice the aforesaid trends are largely neutalized by other factors. At any rate, the U.S. economy is much more stable in the face of outside influences than the economies of the U.S. partners.

By all accounts, the Amerians are in no rush to get the dollar out of its free fall. It is to their advantage to squeeze their friends even more. They have on their side the reliability of the U.S. economic mechanism and the unique position of the dollar in the imperialist foreign exchange system. However, in extricating themselves from one difficult situation, Americans are creating others that are no less difficult. There is no end to them in sight.

NEW CIA DIRECTOR FACES 'IMPOSSIBLE TASK'

LD072327 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Text] The appointment of Gates, the new director of the CIA, in place of Casey, who has retired for health reasons, has been welcomed with enthusiasm by the American bourgeois press. Better work is expected of the spying and sabotage department under its new director. At the microphone is our commentator, Vitaliy Sobolev:

[Sobolev] The CIA has often disappointed both the broad American public and the Washington leadership. Its record includes the failure of the Bay of Pigs adventure, the fall of the Shah's regime in Iran, and many other setbacks to the U.S. imperialist policy. Evidently for this reasn the naming of each new director arouses hopes there either of a moral purge or of greater efficiency. Of Gates both things are expected. In the moral sphere he is supposed to clean up -- as American journalists put it -- the dirt of the Irangate scandal.

The new director has to give a new coat of paint to his department's facade, which has also suffered from the fact the CIA was arming, training and feeding the Somozists at the very time when Congress had decreed it should temporarily refrain from doing so. Indeed, the CIA is plagued by quite a number of major and very major sins which Gates must make the country and the world forget. Whether it can be done is another matter. As for effectiveness, here, in the opinion of American observers, Gates inherits a better legacy. Under his predecessor, Casey, the department doubled its budget and reorganized its subsections; the morale of the knights of the cloak and dagger was improved. There does seem to be a grain of truth in this: The Reagan administration has shown great solicitude, not only for the Pentagon, but also for the intelligence and sabotage service. They are, indeed, getting twice as much money. It is difficult to share the usual U.S. confidence that dollars work miracles and that effectiveness is directly proportionate to capital investment.

One may agree that Gates is a professional, because he even wrote a thesis on the history of our country. The CIA is going to have to operate within the framework of the same old imperialist policy. Moreover, the agency is being assigned the role of strike force in the attempts to halt the struggle of people in various parts of the world for a better and more just life. However well honed Gates' professionalism may be, as regards effectiveness his task is still more impossible thn the moral improvement of the institution entrusted to his care.

U.S. CHANNEL SHOWS MOSCOW TV OPPOSITE 'AMERIKA'

LD080159 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 7 Feb 87

[Report by correspondent in New York]

[Text] Millions of American TV viewers will be able to tune in on Soviet television the same week a U.S. television network will present the anti-Soviet serial "Amerika". The Discovery channel signed an agreement Wednesday to broadcast 62 hours of Channel 1, Moscow, to 14 million Discovery subscribers 15th to 22nd February. The agreement was signed with Orbiter Technologies, a New York-based satellite transmission company.

Our mission is totally apolotical, it is simply to bring the world into the living rooms of our subscribers, said (?John Hendricks), chairman of the Discovery cable channel. Discovery broadcasts will be the first in what is hoped to be seven experiments nationwide with television.

Orbiter Chairman (?Ken Schaffer) said, seeing Moscow as easily as you see downtown makes Moscow as close as downtown, it is not another planet it is just a microwave away.

Speaking of the Soviet television programs (?Jonathan Sanders), assistant director of the Averill Harriman Institute for Advanced studies of the Soviet Union at Columbia University, said: Television provides scholars with a window on Soviet reality.

Soviet TV has much to offer American friends, said (?Boris Malakov), spokesman for the Soviet Embassy in Washington. We have ballets, cultural programs and friendly human cartoons for children.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS INCREASED PRC BORDER TRADE

PM061241 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Yu. Savenkov Beijing dispatch: "Trade is Growing"]

[Text] The border trade resumed in 1983 between the USSR's Far Eastern regions and the autonomous region of Inner Mongolia (PRC) increased by 9 percent last year in comparison to 1985.

This was reported by Li Shiming, director of the local foreign economic ties and foreign trade administration. China mainly exports food products and clothing and imports from the Soviet Union machine equipment, timber, cement, and chemical fertilizers. In December last year, XINHUA reports, the two sides agreed to organize a vegetable production base in the autonomous region of Inner Mongolia. The Soviet side will supply chemical fertilizers and fuel, while the Chinese side will deliver vegetables to the USSR's Far Eastern regions.

Freightcars Contract

PM101203 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] In Beijing a large contract to deliver railroad freightcars from the USSR to the PRC has been signed between the all-union association "Energomasheksport" and the Chinese company for the import and export of machinery and equipment.

PERMANENT SHIPPING OFFICES IN ODESSA, SHANGHAI

OW080857 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] The USSR Morflot has set up a permanent office in Shanghai, according to a representative of the Soviet Ministry of Maritime Fleet. The office will provide services needed by Soviet ships and crews in Shanghai.

The China Ocean Shipping Company will set up a similar office in Odessa.

The representative offices of the two countries will promote shipping service between the USSR and China.

ACTIVISTS MEET CHINESE STUDENTS IN MOSCOW 5 FEB

OW071219 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society met with Chinese students studying at institutes of higher learning in Moscow at the House of Friendship on 5 February. A warm and friendly atmosphere permeated the meeting.

AMBASSADOR, FORMER ENVOY TO FRG INTERVIEWED

Kvitsinskiy Grants Interview

DW091421 Bonn GENERAL-ANZEIGER in German 7 Feb 87 p 3

[Interview with Soviet Ambassador Yuliy Kvitsinskiy by Friedhelm Kemna and Hans-Werner Loose; date and place not given]

[Text] GENERAL-ANZEIGER: General Secretary Gorbachev is trying to propagate reform in the Soviet Union. As Central Committee candidate member, you were a witness to his statement of policy. Is there any opposition to his attempt?

Kvitsinskiy: The Moscow plenum constitutes the consistent continuation of the resolutions of the 27th party congress. Those resolutions are revolutionary. They are the basis for a change in our country's development. The plenum promulgated, defined, or outlined methods to bring about such a change. The idea is to accelerate the development of our society on a socialist basis by drawing on existing resources, enhancing the attractiveness of socialism, and doing more for our people.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Which concepts are new?

Kvitsinskiy: Inactivity and lack of understanding are obstacles to reorganization and reconstruction. Reorientation, new methods, and new thoughts are required.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Are the changes in the Soviet leadership finished?

Kvitsinskiy: Renewal has been carried out to the necessary extent. However, the plenum also stressed that too much stability in personnel policy very often spells inactivity and too much mobility may lead to instability. We must follow the middle road, train new cadres, and employ people where they can help reshape our society in the best and most effective way.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: What effect does the reform policy have on your information and culture policy?

Kvitsinskiy: Our press is now more open and more interesting. Personally signed articles represent personal opinions that do not necessarily give the official viewpoint. The press now often contains controversial views. That has led to the fact that our people are much less interested in Western press and radio reports. It is much more interesting for them to read their own newspapers. In the cultural field, too, there are controversial discussions on literature and the theater. Some people here even interpret that virtually as the formation of some sort of resistance, but that is nonsense. Our cultural workers want to contribute to reform.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Foreign Minister Shevardnadze explained the Central Committee Resolutions and Gorbachev's positions to the GDR and the CSSR. Do you expect those positions to influence other socialist countries?

Kvitsinskiy: The plenum will of course have a strong impact at home and abroad. The resolutions are oriented toward the greater efficiency of socialism, the enhanced attractiveness of our society, the perfection of socialist democracy, and the full use of our social reserves.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Is the Soviet Union merely a model or does it dictate the course for the socialist camp?

Kvitsinskiy: No one need copy every detail of what the Soviet Union is doing at home. Every socialist country has its own specific features. However, if it is necessary to improve socialism, there should be no differences of opinion. We all share the same goal.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: What importance is being attached to economic development?

Kvitsinskiy: Very great importance. The efficiency of our economy is one of the factors on which depend the social changes and the development of our international relations.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: In socialism, too, can nothing be done without money?

Kvitsinskiy: It is not just money. We must catch up with technological development where we have fallen behind in selective areas. We also must be in a position to influence international progress in the fields of science, economy, and the most modern technologies, and we must hold top positions. That issue will have to be resolved consistently.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: The disarmament discussion between the superpowers is burdened by the controversy over the U.S. nuclear weapons tests and the announced resumption of Soviet testing. Does that constitute a foreign policy defeat for Gorbachev, whose moratorium on nuclear tests has been ignored by the United States?

Kvitsinskiy: I would rather see that as another moral defeat for the Reagan administration. Despite the fact that no nuclear test was conducted anywhere in the Soviet Union for 547 days, and despite many requests to the United States, it nevertheless carried out the test in Nevada. The world was about to make the simplest and most effective step toward nuclear disarmament. In 1983, Reagan eloquently announced the elimination of all nuclear weapons as the highest goal of U.S. policy. After the new test, the curtain is torn away. The temple to American's love of peace is empty.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Do military experts in the Soviet Union also exert pressure on the political leadership because certain weapons have not been tested?

Kvitsinskiy: The point is not the pressure by the military. The point is to abolish nuclear weapons and not to allow any more of the arms race. At some point the time will come when you will have to ask yourself whether your own restraint is worthwhile, or whether it affects your own security. We stick to our policy of nuclear disarmament, and we will not yield on it. If the Americans stop testing, we will also stop testing. So our door continues to be wide open.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Is agreement on ABM systems a prerequisite for agreement in other fields?

Kvitsinskiy: In some areas solutions are possible that have nothing to do with space, for instance, the chemical weapons ban, radical cuts in conventional armed forces, the nuclear test ban, and so forth.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Agreement on intermediate-range weapons also?

Kvitsinskiy: Intermediate-range weapons, to the extent that they were discussed in Reykjavik, are part of a package. That is no artificial linkage. After World War II, we made considerable efforts to achieve strategic parity with the United States. That parity absorbed part of our national income and by no means a small part. The nuclear weapons race has led to a dead end. Everybody realizes now that it is no longer worthwhile. We are ready to scrap what we achieved at so much cost. We are ready to destroy all nuclear weapons. However, that only makes sense if the other side does the same and if both sides agree simultaneously not to continue the weapons race in a qualitatively new area. That is why we urge preventing an arms race in space under any circumstances.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: So the Soviet Union links a solution on the intermediate-range area to that demand?

Kvitsinskiy: Yes, the European zero solution for intermediate-range missiles is a component part of the package. Experts in Geneva are now working on texts about space-based weapons, strategic weapons, and intermediate-range missiles. But the United States is complicating work in particular on the intermediate-range missiles.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Does the package also have to contain accords on the reduction of short-range missiles?

Kvitsinskiy: Once a European zero solution for intermediate-range missiles has been reached, we will be ready to enter into negotiations on short-range weapons. However, we reject a linkage. With linkage hardly anything moves. Basically, it is being used in an attempt to put together another package and prevent a quick solution for intermediate-range missiles. However, the USSR advocates the total destruction of all tactical nuclear weapons within a short time. That is the second stage of Gorbachev's program of 15 January 1986. Those weapons are particularly dangerous, because they might lead to the idea of limited use. If it starts, it would be very hard to stop. The destructive power of those weapons would be terrible, particularly in European circumstances.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Is the German-Soviet dialogue being resumed following the Bundestag elections? What will be discussed with the new federal government?

Kvitsinskiy: The reorientation of our economy opens up new opportunities for cooperation with the West. Instead of the past simple trade relations, we want to have production relations, including joint ventures or, at any rate, more intensive forms of cooperation. That does not mean that West German, Japanese, or French companies will be mushrooming in the Soviet Union. Because of the size of our country, its population, and the complexity of its economic problems, foreigners will never be able to resolve problems for us. However, there are opportunities to participate selectively in that process of reorganization where it is worthwhile for both sides. That would be politically advantageous, because production relations create more stability and confidence.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Does the offer of cooperation also include the area of nuclear energy and security and the research related to it?

Kvitsinskiy: It also includes nuclear energy. If the foreign offers are interesting enough and economically accpetable, we will consider them. Like Foreign Minister Genscher, we also want to overcome Europe's technological division. Environmental protection, transportation, energy, and space are of interest. So there are many opportunities.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: How about bilateral relations?

Kvitsinskiy: Imagination and good deeds are necessary to normalize the situation and get the dialogue going again. Courageous steps are necessary to get the dialogue going. Press reports following my talks with the federal foreign minister that all will automatically be well after the government statement are wrong. Neither of us has said that. However, in the long run we will try to clear up the situation and to establish a relationship with the FRG that will develop positively in the interests of understanding between our peoples and international peace. We take the concept of the common European house seriously.

GENERAL-ANZEIGER: Is an unprejudiced dialogue possible after Federal Chancellor Kohl's remarks on Goebbels and Gorbachev? For how long could irritation prevent a personal meeting between Kohl and Gorbachev.

Kvitsinskiy: The comparison has done harm. It was the most inadmissible remark conceivable. It is premature to talk about a meeting. We will first have to normalize the situation and overcome the interruption. There have been and will continue to be prejudices. They are rooted in history and in everyday policy. However, we should not be guided by prejudices. We must look ahead. Depicting people as enemies should be avoided on both sides. There are opportunities to improve our relations. That would also have a positive impact on relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, as well as on the situation in Europe.

Former Envoy Falin Interviewed

DW101121 Bonn DIE WELT in German 10 Feb 87 p 7

[Interview with former ambassador to Bonn Valentin Falin by Rose-Marie Borngaesser and Manfred Schell in Moscow; no date given]

[Text] DIE WELT: Mr Falin, the past federal government will also be the new federal government in Bonn. You would have preferred to see the SPD and the Greens in the government. How will the Soviet leadership adjust to the FRG election results?

Falin: What we would have preferred, if anything, is our own business. We have taken notice of the election results, and we maintain relations with governments, not with parties. We have noted very carfully what FRG officials said about the value of relations with the Soviet Union prior to and following the elections. We hope that it will have a positive effect.

DIE WELT: Tough statements were made by Bonn and Moscow in the election campaign. Are they now forgottten?

Falin: There were too many tough statements on your part. The Soviet Union was trying to be unbiased, even though it has every right to comment on events from its own viewpoint.

DIE WELT: Is it compatible with impartiality for you to court SPD politicians and Greens like official visitors, but not to invite German Government members? In addition, the DKP, your fraternal party, called for voting SPD.

Falin: As for the voting appeal, that is the DKP's not the Soviet Union's business. The reason for the cancellation of the visits lay not in Moscow, but in Bonn. I refer to not just certain remarks, by also harsh and unfriendly positions, concepts, and so forth.

DIE WELT: Which ones do you have in mind?

Falin: For instance, the discussion on the Soviet Union's role before, during, and after World War II. That is not just a debate among historians. It is a discussion with a glaring political dimension.

DIE WELT: Federal Chancellor Kohl has retracted his comparison of Goebbels and Gorbachev. He did not mean to offend the general secretary. Moscow reacted to the incident through diplomatic channels, but has not sufficiently informed the people. Why such a procedure?

Falin: The statement made by Foreign Minister Shevardnadze at a news conference was published in our newspapers. If we had pursued the matter too far, we would have touched off a sharp reaction among the Soviet people, and the damage then would have been much larger and more lasting. That would not have been in the interests of relations between our two countries.

DIE WELT: There have been reports time and again that Gorbachev expects Helmut Kohl to write him a personal letter.

Falin: You are asking me too much in that respect. It depends on Bonn rather than Moscow as to what policy will be pursued.

DIE WELT: Deputy Prime Minister Antonov is scheduled to visit Bonn. Does that mean the confict is settled?

Falin: What was said was said. But I hope that the primary interests between Bonn and Moscow will really also play a primary role in our relations, which would mean that the new year had begun constructively. Our basic concern is still what it was 15 years ago. We want good relations. We call that detente.

DIE WELT: Do you also include overlapping common interests?

Falin: We are doomed to live together or die together, whether a war is unleashed deliberately or incidentally. Therefore, both countries are responsible for preventing harm. I mean by that not just the military aspects, but also minimizing technological risks. Chernobyl and Sandoz have revealed the dimensions. In addition, in Helsinki we recognized every country's right to settle its internal affairs without outside interference. In other words, the West must finally stop trying to decide, according to its own pattern, what is good and what is bad in the East.

DIE WELT: As for Chernobyl, it was not the West, but the Soviet Union that failed.

Falin: What happens on our side is usually tragic. What happens on your side is less terrible. How many pages did DIE WELT publish about the Bhopal poison disaster, and how many about Chernobyl?

DIE WELT: We published detailed reports on both events. Bhopal was horrible; Chernobyl terrified Europe.

Falin: In your country, people have tried to explain problems of higher radioactivity in your own power plants by citing Chernobyl. I am not trying to trivialize Chernobyl. We must learn from the accident. Chernobyl was attributal to gross human, not technical, failure. I agree with you that in such cases information must be made available as quickly as possible to all interested parties. However, in this case, the government in Moscow was initially deceived. Local authorities trivialized the disaster, stating they would be able to bring developments under control on their own.

DIE WELT: In a different and earlier context, you mentioned constructive elements in relations with Bonn. Do you think it is possible that General Secretary Gorbachev will visit the FRG in 1987?

Falin: I do not know. That may be subject of discussion during Antonov's forthcoming visit.

DIE WELT: Mr Falin, remarkable events have been happening in your country. Sakharov was allowed to return to Moscow, a KGB officer's replacement was reported. How are such events to be assessed?

Falin: As practical fulfillment of what Gorbachev and the political leadership have decided. We want more socialism, more democracy, the particpation of all people in the political, social, and economic processes, not only in theory but in practice.

DIE WELT: Gorbachev said before the Central Committee that the Soviet Union has now reached the level of the thirties or forties. That is a depressing analysis, is it not?

Falin: Your interpretation of Gorbachev is wrong. Every shortcoming in the Soviet Union is the result of too little socialism, if we base our analysis on Marx and Lenin. Socialism does not mean that the masses should be kept away from the decisionmaking processes. On the contrary, direct and active participation is important. Regrettably, it is a fact that in the course of the revolution and the period of foreign intervention, it was extremely difficult, almost impossible objectively to practice real democracy. After Lenin's death, the level of political leadership and the level of thought decreased in our country. People were not trying to find the best possible, but the simplest, solutions. That method of so-called war communism was also practiced later, because it allowed people to pass on directives without much effort. Of course, war communism was also imposed on us by outside conditions. Imagine my country's situation following Hitler's invasion. The idea was not to discuss it, but to make sure that the aggression was countered. But habits become ingrained. The exception was continued and has become an obstacle. That is the mistake. The past does not always have adequate answers to the challenges of today.

DIE WELT: Back to Sakharov. Will more people be released from prison camps who advocate human rights and the free exchange of information? Will there be an amnesty?

Falin: Your question is incorrect and forces me to contradict you. In our country, nobody who advocates the free exchange of opinion and information is kept in prison camps. There are only people who violated our laws. The Federal Republic proceeds in the same way.

DIE WELT: But the decisive thing is how the laws are formulated, is it not?

Falin: Besides my basic position, I am saying that the law is a framework that may be narrow or broad. It may be so narrow that no flexibility is possible. I proceed on the assumption that more democracy, more openness, and more criticism require a more generous legislative framework. In our country, everything is considered, including the approach to people who have misbehaved.

DIE WELT: But you suppressed demonstrations in Kazakhstan.

Falin: Those were not demonstrations, but acts of violence. For that, people in your country are also punished. There were no casualties among the demonstrators, but there were casualties among those who were responsible for order. Young people were trying to provoke the militia by committing acts of violence and setting cars and shops on fire.

DIE WELT: Many people in the West and probably in the East call Gorbachev's new course breathtaking. Would you agree to that assessment?

Falin: One should keep one's breath and one's nerves. Both are of vital importance. However, what is happening in our country is a revolution, not only regarding the depth and quality, but also regarding the consistency. The policy will not be broken off.

DIE WELT: What final point is Gorbachev heading for?

Falin: We want democracy to be not just a slogan or term. It must become visible. In the future, everybody will be elected: factory directors who will have to face competition, heads of departments, chiefs of brigades, directors of institutes, and the first secretaries of the regional party organizations. Deputies who, following their election, evade control by citizens and lose the confidence of the people will be replaced. Everybody must be aware that he is not a master but a servant. However, I must make a qualifying remark. Things will not be as they were following the October Revolution: At that time, army commanders were elected. Professors who had been stern with their students lost their professorships and had to emigrate to the United States. Such excesses, which turn democracy into anarchy, are not tolerated in our country.

DIE WELT: How about elections by secret ballot in the Central Committee and for top positions?

Falin: We already have elections by secret ballot. There are approvals as well as rejections. It is quite possible that Central Committee secretaries also will be elected by secret ballot. They and the general secretary have always been elected by open ballot. At any rate, the election of Central Committee secretaries by secret ballot would not contradict the logic of Gorbachev's policy.

DIE WELT: Gorbachev has submitted to the Central Committee a proposal on elections by secret ballot, but the Central Committee resolution does not mention it. How do you explain that?

Falin: The Central Committee resolution is unemotional. It is formulated dryly. That is a tradition. It may be that new and better formulations can be found for new ideas. However, not the form but the content is the important thing. In that respect, there is no difference between the general secretary's address and the Central Committee's resolution.

DIE WELT: Ukrainian Party Chief Shcherbitskiy is still a Politburo member. Does that not have to be interpreted as a sign of weakness for Gorbachev?

Falin: In the Western press, speculation has special importance. This is also a tradition and, admittedly, it is fascinating. In our country, such speculation is not a sign of democracy.

DIE WELT: So we can continue to speculate?

Falin: If you like.

DIE WELT: Are you not worried that Gorbachev is overplaying his hand?

Falin: We can talk about such a danger in one respect: Gorbachev works too hard. I do not know how long a man can work 16 hours every day, virtually without a day off. That is a problem. However, as to Gorbachev's policy, he has the broad support of the people and the party.

DIE WELT: Probably what is decisive is not the people but the attitude of the party apparatus. You said that Gorbachev realizes that changing ways of thinking is always the most difficult. He needs time for that. How much time does Gorbachev have?

Falin: He has time as long as he enjoys the support of the people and the party. He has time as long as he believes that he can perform his work better than others. Gorbachev is self-critical. He also said that we are just at the beginning. It may be that the change of thought and action will last until 1990, when quantity will become quality; perhaps even longer. We need time to bring younger generations into leading positions. In its considerations, the party assumes that an office is not conferred for life, no matter what merits a person may have. We need new resources, new ideas, and new inspirations. We must stop thinking in narrow categories.

DIE WELT: How would you characterize Gorbachev?

Falin: He is a man with a clear tendency toward all that is new. He is a dialectical thinker and assumes that the past is no answer to the challenges of today. He is ready to correct himself and to review assessments in the light of new findings.

DIE WELT: Do you consider it luck that finally a man in his mid-fifties has become general secretary?

Falin: It certainly does no harm that a farsighted man who is creative and democratic leads the country. It is good for us.

DIE WELT: Where are the critics? In the Politburo, in the apparatus? In more distant regions like the Ukraine?

Falin: It would be unnatural if everyone accepted the new course. It would be improbable, and we would have to be suspicious. There are misunderstandings; there are people who tend to represent such democratization as eyewash or as pseudo-renewal. There are people who work with a minimum of everything, including a minimum of thought. Of course there are also people who were well off previously, who were engaged in mismanagement and capitalized on it as a source of personal advantage. Those people are trying to obstruct progress.

Let me mention an example of our problems. In more than 1,500 enterprises we introduced state quality control. That is a hard test for a number of staff people. In the past they did harm three times over: They produced poor-quality goods from material; they made society poorer because they devalued the work done before; and they wasted their efforts on goods that were less profitable, but they were paid for it.

Now we are returning to the principle of performance that Lenin talked about as early as in 1918. That means specifically: more performance -- better pay; less performance -- less pay; and poor work will be punished.

There will be no easy way. However, resistance to the new policy is not great enough to make the course fail.

DIE WELT: Moscow's new course may constitute an explosive force for others like Honecker and Husak.

Falin: We do not write recipes. We make no bones about our positive and negative experiences. Our friends will decide themselves what they should do. I am certain that what will be done in the CSSR will not be done in the Soviet way. That also applies to the GDR.

DIE WELT: You are making considerable understatements about Moscow's leading role.

Falin: You in the West make a mistake in assuming that Moscow's hand is so long and so hard.

DIE WELT: Taking all your statements together, we would come to the conclusion that under Gorbachev today, the Prague Spring with Dubcek would be tolerated.

Falin; In the Prague Spring you mentioned, it was not just Czechoslovak forces that were involved.

DIE WELT: Do you mean to say that Dubcek was a puppet of other countries?

Falin: I do not want to use the term puppet. But it is an established fact that the CSSR at the time was picked as a testing ground for foreign cultures.

DIE WELT: Back to the new policy in Moscow. Is criticism of the Brezhnev era an element of reorientation?

Falin: Criticism of that era means criticism of wrong developments, corruption, and other things. That is being uncovered and consistently prosecuted. The party will see to it that the responsible people will be made to account in one way or another. It is necessary to explain the fact to the people that mismanagement is not the product of the system, but the result of the misuse of power and incompetence. It is attributable to people who pursued their own personal interests and those of their clans in politics and the economy. That holds true for all, and sons-in-law were usually included.

DIE WELT: One of the problems you want to overcome and solve is Afghanistan. How many of your soldiers lost their lives in that "Soviet Vietnam?"

Falin: A comparison with Vietnam is inappropriate. Please take a look at the map. Anybody can see "who is who." Second, I confirm your assumption that the Soviet Union wants to solve the Afghanistan problem in such a way that none of our soldiers will remain in that country. That is our goal. Our people are also victims in Afghanistan, and every person killed or injured is one too many.

DIE WELT: What kind of solution are you striving for in Afghanistan? When will all Soviet troops have been withdrawn?

Falin: For decades we have had good-neighborly relations with Afghanistan. The Soviet Union did not seek complications and did not cause any. The April revolution was not responsible for the destabilization of Afghanistan. You would be mistaken if you picked the year 1976 out of the calendar.

Why is that important to determine? He who does not understand the beginning will not understand the end. I would also not want to assess the opportunities as against the difficulties. The Soviet Union was and is prepared to withdraw its troops virtually immediately within the framework of a political settlement that guarantees the existence and further development of Afghanistan as a nonaligned, neutral, and sovereign state that enjoys one right, like any other, of living without meddling from outside, no matter under whatever slogan or flag.

To sum it up: The Soviet Union is not safeguarding any strategic, political, or economic interest, either on a permanent or temporary basis, and seeks no military presence. We will withdraw our troops. The Soviet side is trying very hard to make it happen sooner, rather than later.

10,000 TURKS TO HELP WITH CONSTRUCTION WORK

For a report on plans of Turkish contractors to employ 10,000 Turkish workers for construction projects in the USSR, see the Turkey section of the 11 February Western Europe DAILY REPORT.

BELYAYEV VIEWS MIDEAST SCENE, EGYPTIAN RELATIONS

PM051555 London AL-TADAMUN in Arabic 31 Jan 87 pp 22, 23

[Interview with Igor Belyayev, Soviet journalist, writer, political commentator, and expert on Middle East affairs, by Kamran Qurrah Daghi in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Daghi] We have learned that you are currently writing a book on Iran. What do you want to say in this book?

[Belyayev] Simply, I want to remind the reader of an age-old fact which we tend to forget most of the time, namely that the policy of Western states or, let us say, the Anglo-American or Anglo-Saxon state, if you like, is based on the "divide and rule" principle. I do not know why this is forgotten except rarely in recent times.

What has happened in Iran? The moment the deposed Shah took the initiative to raise oil prices to the abhorrence of the West and began talking about transforming Iran into the Sweden or West Germany of the Middle East, the West suffered from a headache. This was because the ruler of an economically backward country in the Middle East is a partner with the West; but the ruler of an economically advanced country in this region would be a competitor and a rival, indeed an enemy to the West. The danger lies in that such a ruler could become an example for others to follow.

Let us remember that in 1974, the Shah began making his heated statements about transforming Iran into the Sweden or West Germany of the Middle East. In 1975 the Shah signed the Algiers protocol with Iraq, an agreement which hit the West where it hurts most because it changed the political-military and even the racial balance in the region. In fact Iran began to move closer toward the Arabs and further away from Israel. Then irrefutable evidence of this transformation came after about a year with a visit to Tehran by the late Saudi King Khalid Ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, which resulted in the signing of the famous Saudi-Iranian agreement. Since when did such developments take place in the region? The history of the Pahlavi family indicates that this was happening for the first time. Also at that time the Shah concluded the biggest economic agreement with the Soviet Union regarding the gas pipeline. These developments were greater than the Western states, the Anglo-American alliance, or Anglo-Saxon West could stomach.

Here I will mention an incident that is symbolic: When the Islamic revolution was at its peak in 1979, Vinogradov, the Soviet ambassador to Tehran, called his embassy staff for a meeting by the statue of Aleksandr Griboyedov in the courtyard of the old Soviet embassy building, now occupied by the Soviet trade mission, in order to honor Griboyedov on the anniversary of his assassination. On the same day 150 years before, a gang had attacked the embassy building, killing all the staff, including Griboyedov, the famous Russian poet and diplomat.

Who killed ambassador Griboyedov? Elements from the Iranian Shi'ites. Who instigated them? The British. The British have always been like that, spreading rumors among the ranks of the Iranian Shi'ites and agitating them against Russia, and later against the Soviet Union after the 1917 revolution.

From that day in 1979, I began to search for documents, sources, and books until I finally came to the conclusion that the British were always behind Iranian events. This is the subject of my book and I do not want to reveal my secrets in advance. But I can say that I have made some discoveries. [paragraph continues]

At present I think it is enough to mention the following fact: Khomeyni's statements made against the Americans are endless, but his statements against the British are almost nonexistent.

[Daghi] It is no secret that the Soviets are playing a role or roles in what is happening between PLO factions on one hand and between some of these factions and Syria on the other. Have you learned anything new in this regard?

[Belyayev] Instead of everyone uniting following the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, they became divided as if to prove that the invasion had achieved its objective. We know very well that talk about Arab unity appears to be unreasonable at present because there is a prevailing phenomenon of strife rather than harmony. Instead of a united Arab stand, each one has been busy solving his own problems within the boundaries of a single country.

As for the Palestinian revolution, as is already known, its ranks have become divided. We in Moscow absolutely did not attribute this division to Yasir 'Arafat personally, although we did not support some of his steps, in particular the Amman accord and also his role in relations to the call for a PNC [Palestine National Council] meeting. It is true that Palestinian internal problems must be solved by the Palestinians themselves and that others have to accept what they decide to do, but let us consider what happened: There are those who emerged from the Palestinian resistance movement believing that the Americans are capable of making some sort of offer. This is a grave mistake. I am completely convinced that neither today nor tomorrow nor even in the near future will the Americans ever become partners with the Palestinians. To expect this to happen is just a tragic waste of time. The tragedy lies in that the Palestinians will gain nothing but disappointment if it is assumed that such a matter will take place. The irony is that Israel is the strategic ally of the United States in the region. So, on what basis can one assume that the Americans would suddenly change their position and begin to consider a just solution to the Palestinian problem?

Of course, Palestinian unity is no easy question, and the interests and considerations of other Arab parties are not the only factors for achieving it. Whatever the attitudes of the Arab states and however they want to solve the Palestinian problem, whether they like it or not they eventually will be forced to agree on the fact that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The unity of the PLO ranks is the major problem. Without this unity, the Palestinian struggle will not achieve its objectives. Therefore, all the disputes within the organization at present can be settled by rapprochement and unity of ranks. All parties concerned should help in settling these disputes. I do not want to say that Israel is the main beneficiary of the Palestinian division, because that is obvious. But since when did the Americans side with Arab rights in general, let alone Palestinian rights? The United States has always supported the other side. Take, for instance, the scandal of U.S. arms supplies to Iran: Since 1981 the United States has been backing Iran and practically aiming at bringing Iraq to its knees, although Iraq, during this period, had taken some steps to express goodwill toward restoring diplomatic relations with Washington. But this is how the United States usually operates. Its only concern is its interests in the Middle East and it completely ignores Palestinian interests and Arab interests in general.

In addition, unity of the Palestinian ranks means unity of the Arab ranks. We in the Soviet Union have not criticized any of the Palestinian resistance leaders because we still believe that the matter is in the hands of the Palestinians themselves, who alone should settle this problem.

[Daghi] There has recently been increasing speculation about the possibility of a Syrian-Israeli confrontation. [paragraph continues]

To what extent, in your opinion, can this confrontation be considered realistic? Assuming that such a confrontation were to take place, what would the Soviet position be?

[Belyayev] I have been following Syrian-Israeli affairs for some time. In Tel Aviv they have been talking about a war against Damascus for a long time. They talked about it a year and even 2 years ago. In 1983, one of the periodical meetings between the Americans and ourselves took place at the level of experts on Middle Eastern affairs. The Americans raised this question: Where do you draw the red line beyond which the Syrian-Soviet treaty is applied?

My answer to this question was: This line passes along the Syrian borders. Soviet-Syrian cooperation will not harm anyone. The treaty between us includes Article VIII, which provides for consultation. Cooperation between the two parties extends beyond the economic and cultural fields. We consider that this cooperation is undoubtedly a very significant factor in assessing the political-military situation in the Middle East. Now, when they talk about a war against Syria, there are two possibilities: The first is to direct a blow at the Syrian forces in the Al-Biqa' valley, and I doubt if this blow would go unchallenged; the second is to attack Syria directly and this means crossing the red line to which I referred earlier when I answered the Americans.

If I were in Israel's position, as a politician and a military person, I would not launch hastily this so-called preventive strike. Israel once again has set its propaganda machine in motion: Syria possesses missiles which carry chemical warheads capable of striking cities and paralyzing their inhabitants with the nerve gas they contain, and the propaganda goes on. I do not believe that this is accidental. So, why is it now possible to wage a war against Syria?

First: The first strike will come from Israel with the United States' support. In fact, this blow will not be aimed at Syria as such but indirectly at the Soviet Union because it is a partner with Syria. In my opinion, this campaign is somehow similar to the arms deal with Iran. Israel strikes at Syria and the United States claims that it has nothing to do with it. A successful blow against Syria would jeopardize the Soviet Union's prestige in the region because, consequently, the Arabs would once again question the effectiveness of Soviet support, and questions arise from this scenario. I cannot talk prematurely about the kind of attitude this party or that party would adopt, but I would say that the crucial factor would be to give a decisive response to any strike however strong it may be. Now, the question is: Are the Syrians ready for this? The answer, in my opinion, is yes for many reasons: First, there are lessons which have been learned from Lebanon; second, the current political-military situation in the region with all its negative aspects is not in Israel's interest. I do not believe that a new war would lead to a new wave of chauvinist spirit inside Israel. Everyone realizes where chauvinism has led after the invasion of Lebanon. The most important thing is the long-term consequences of the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel. This alliance will certainly continue as an extension to the policy of supplying Iran with arms, which is an anti-Arab policy. In this way, the United States will lose a lot in the region this time.

[Daghi] A final question on your assessment of Egyptian-Soviet relations: Are there any indications that they will improve?

[Belyayev] Frankly, I am not optimistic about these relations. I last visited Egypt in November 1982, and I had the opportunity then to observe American activity in the country. Generally, I was disappointed. [paragraph continues]

The reason, as I see it, is that the late President Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir always considered that one of the Egyptian revolution's main objectives was to restore pride and dignity to the Egyptian people and, as he used to say, to build a new generation. The hijacking of an Egyptian airliner last year by the Americans was a slap in the face for Egypt. I would not say that Egypt, after receiving that slap, should have declared war against the United States, but if we look at this incident from the standpoint of pride and dignity, the American slap was very hard to bear. One thing was immediately established -- that Egypt failed to respond to this U.S. humiliation -- which was reflected in the nature of U.S.-Egyptian relations. In Cairo they told me that Egypt does not provide the Americans with military bases. This is true, but it does provide them with facilities equal to establishing military bases. In this context, I will add that Egypt does not need to participate in U.S.-Egyptian military maneuvers because, in my opinion, its participation in such maneuvers does not serve its own interests.

What about Egyptian-Soviet relations? Here I must recall an undeniable fact that nobody should ignore: When Egyptian-Soviet relations were flourishing, Egypt was an international state, because not only the Arab world but indeed the whole world used to listen to it. This was because Egypt possessed a gigantic power at the international level. Of course, this was linked to President Nasir's person and the Egyptian revolution. However, at the same time, it was also linked to a considerable degree to the phenomenon of Egyptian-Soviet relations. Egypt knew for certain that there was a superpower standing by its side that would not permit anyone to insult it without being punished. At present another superpower is by Egypt's side pressuring it, exploiting it, and, indeed, ready to trample upon it if it can.

Regarding Egyptian-Soviet relations, I would say that Egypt is finding enormous difficulties in changing the status of these relations. Therefore, we cannot but wait in the hope that the future will provide a more suitable opportunity for making the required change. However, as for the restoration of relations similar to those during 'Abd al-Nasir's era, it is still a very, very distant objective. Al-sadat inflicted a loss on Egypt that it is difficult to assess. Regrettably, the destructive effects of this are still felt.

As for some of the recent measures at the level of economic and other relations, they are minor and do not reach a level deserving to be considered as playing a part in transforming Egyptian-Soviet friendship into a better state. However, I would say that, in principle, Egyptian-Soviet relations can be improved and developed, but this matter depends on many other issues to be considered.

ISRAELI COMMUNIST PARTY PLENUM MEETS 6-7 FEB

LD092150 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] A regular plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel took place on February 6 and 7, at which a report was delivered by Vilner, general secretary of the CPI Central Committee. It is stressed in a resolution adopted by the plenum of the CPI Central Committee that the government of the Likud and Ma'arakh blocs is hardening its policy aimed against the working people, intensifying the oppression in the occupied Arab territories and subjecting to discrimination the Arab population in Israel itself. The Likud-Ma'arakh coalition hinders a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem and is conducting preparations for a new war of aggression in the area. The current government, the document notes, represents a threat to democratic freedoms also, and increases the risk of fascism in Israel.

MOSCOW NEWS REBUTS CHARGE OF 'POLITICAL ERRORS'

PM091435 [Editorial Report] Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 6, 8 February 1987, publishes on page 13, under the headline "Strictly Personal? A Reply to a Reader Who Wished To Remain Anonymous" and the rubric "The Individual and Society," a letter from a reader identified only by the initials A.M.L. to NOVOSTI Board Chairman Valentin Falin. The letter is prefaced by the following introduction:

"Recently the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY received a letter addressed to the Chairman of its Board, Valentin Falin, and marked 'Strictly Personal' However, the questions touched upon in it are by far not personal and the aims pursued in the letter are different. Therefore we publish its text, identifying the author only by his initials."

The letter reads as follows:

"I am writing to you with profound concern about serious shortcomings or maybe even political errors in the ideological stance of the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS, published by APN and circulated in 140 countries.

"The paper's ideological orientation has changed sharply with the change of its leadership.

"Let me cite a few examples.

"In the issue of January 11, 1987, on its front page, it is printed in bold letters: 'Learning democracy'. Have we lived 70 years and only now started to learn democracy?

"On page 10 of the same issue there is an article entitled 'The Comeback' devoted to Tarkovskiy, which justifies his non-return to his homeland. Moreover, its author claims that our cinematography is a 'Potemkin village'.

"In the article 'Belated Measles' its author labels everyone who deals with the implementation of Lenin's doctrine on the partisanship of literature and art as 'ideological opponents'. In the item 'Energy of Historical Knowledge', there is a speech by the rector of the Moscow State Institute of Historian-Archivists at the Learned Council in which he, speculating on questions of the personality cult, declares for restoring the positive assessments of various kinds of oppositionists, in some measure regards the Menshevik deviations and various varieties of Menshevism as labelling, etc.

"Regrettably, this line can be discerned in other issues of the paper as well.

"In issue No. 45 (November 9, 1986) there is an article by Raykin, in which he writes that in our country instead of 'the grandiose success' there is 'bad management', instead of 'the great achievement' -- a great mess, and instead of 'heroic efforts' -- drunkenness.

"I think that even an avowed enemy of the USSR would think twice before saying this about our Motherland.

"The issue of December 14, 1986 features a speech by Shatrov (real name -- Marshak) at the Congress of Theatrical Workers. [paragraph continues]

In his speech he asserts that the October Revolution was followed by moral devastation, the spread of a slavish psychology and the onset of social and political apathy. Further he reasons that history has given us yet another opportunity and it is our duty not to miss it. What opportunity is in question?

"Whom does this ideological orientation of a newspaper, circulated worldwide, serve?

"Openness needs wisdom.

"A.M.L., CPSU member since 1939

"Moscow, January 13, 1987."

The letter is accompanied by the following response from Yegor Yakovlev:

"Talking With Him... [Subhead]

"You have written -- we have been waiting for this. I won't say that every day we have run to the post office for a letter, but we have waited: we were sure it would come -- if not today, then tomorrow. No, we do not know each other. The simple truth is that themes raised in the pages of MOSCOW NEWS cannot help irritating a certain group of people. The reconstruction, as we know, has stirred up society's healthy elements, and others besides.

"Nevertheless, it has to be admitted that the letter is impressive. Although the times have changed, even today the mention of 'political errors' is not conducive to a cheerful frame of mind. Let us begin therefore with the facts.

"In her article 'The Comeback' Tatyana Khoplyankina writes: 'The purifying thunderstorm which broke out at the 5th Congress of Film Makers blasted to smithereens the huge Potemkin village our cinematography was about (my emphasis - Ye. Ya.) to grow into...' But you ascribe to her this contention: '...Our cinematography is a Potemkin village'. In his feuilleton 'Belated Measles' Leonid Likhodeyev makes the ironic remark: At times we so hotly respond to the escapades of our ideological opponents -- as if they 'daily examine us in social and political science'. You say: The author labels as ideological opponents 'everyone who deals with the implementation of Lenin's doctrine on the partisanship of literature and art...'

"Speaking at the Learned Council Professor Yuriy Afanasyev, rector of the Institute of Historian-Archivists, says that Lenin's last letters and articles are presented to students in a superficial way, that his characteristics given to Central Committee members of the Party are quoted one-sidedly. You, however, accuse the scholar of speculating 'on questions of the personality cult.'

"Arkadiy Raykin reasons from the rostrum of the constituent congress of the Theatrical Workers Union of the Russian Federation (the paper printed not an article but a public speech) -- he speaks about those who yesterday spoke fervently and enthusiastically about one thing, but today cry about something entirely different: 'about bad management instead of the "grandiose success", about the great mess instead of the "great achievement", and about drunkenness instead of "heroic efforts." 'You, however, address your words not to the timeserver, but to Raykin: 'Even an avowed enemy of the USSR would think twice before saying this about our Motherland'."

"Let us stop delving into the sources of slander. Your main remedy is exaggerations and juggling. This occupation has its own genre -- anonymous letters. But in our days it is pointless to write them: People still read but no longer investigate them. Therefore your letter is signed by a very widespread second name plus initials. but the return address is not indicated on the envelope. There is no erstwhile confidence that a statement of this kind will be supported at once.

"...And Reflecting About Him [subhead]

"I may not be right in so primitively portraying a reader who wished to remain anonymous. I suspect him of deliberately juggling with the facts. But this most likely implies something different: the automatism of that mode of thinking in which any opinion differing from one's own is always hostile -- and there is no need to go deep into it or present it authentically. The automatism of the schemes which are so rigid that they cannot hold any non-ordinary manifestation of the human personality: neither over-loud laughter, nor too obvious wrath, nor even too evident sadness. Everything human is alien! There is no room even for tragedy and death, such as happened to Andrey Tarkovskiy which prevented him from returning home.

"Writing his letter, the reader evidently believed that he was complaining about the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS. In actual fact, he is complaining about the time. He sees the reasons in the change of the paper's leadership and fails to notice the ideological principles which have prevailed since the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and the 27th CPSU Congress in Soviet journalism -- offensive, open, socially just and recognizing no proscriptive themes. Including those about our past.

"Having joined the Party on the eve of the Great Patriotic War, our reader has evidently lived a very uneasy life, worthy of true respect. And one can understand, even sympathize, how difficult it is in advanced age to give up living axioms, which required no proofs in the past but which all of a sudden have become theorems. But a man, whose youth passed with the song 'Our locomotive is flying ahead...', should not now take a seat in a carriage, pull down the curtains, imagine movement, and throw accusations at everyone who is trying to take him out of this state.

"Indeed, revolutionary transformations are surging ahead. 'A new moral atmosphere is shaping in the country,' Mikhail Gorbachev said in his report at the January Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. 'A reappraisal of values and their creative rethinking is under way, debates have opened on ways of reorganizing the economy and social and cultural life, and the quest for new methods of organizational and ideological work has been gaining in scope.' A battle of ideas is under way. But this is something our reader is not prepared to accept. It is clear that Professor Afanasyev is by no means the last judge of truth, whereas the playwright Shatrov is far from always right. So argue with them, prove your case in public. No! He sends out a signal and 'strictly personal'. He is accustomed: from hand to hand, meaningfully and with a hint. [sentence as published] This is what makes him dangerous. It is dangerous for a person with an open visor to fight against an iron mask.

This letter -- not just it alone, of course indicates that it is absolutely necessary and extremely urgent for us to learn democracy. To learn to work in the conditions of unfolding democracy. To learn that democracy which makes it possible to see people with an opposite point of view as worthy opponents and not to brand them at once as enemies. One must not see 'intrigues' or 'counterweights' in those who take a different view of matters or have a different approach, but must value independently-minded people' - this was written by Lenin."

"I can only agree with the last line of our letter: 'Openness needs wisdom'. But, first and foremost, we must agree on what should be understood by openness. Some people believe: The pundit is he who warns, stops and cautions. Others, conversely, are convinced that real wisdom by no means rests with those who call for inaction. What would be wiser for instance -- to keep silent on receiving this letter or to publish it without deleting a word? There are some whose intrinsic ingredient is the immutable wisdom of tightening the screw. Its conduits have become the little screws, or maybe the little cogs, in that mechanism of social and economic braking which, alas, has appeared in recent years.

"The more one ponders over the letter, the more one understands that it was dictated by disbelief in our common strength, in our common dedication to socialism. I shall allow myself a historical disgression. Many people have asked, and on more than one occasion, 'why did the Bolsheviks retain power?' Between February and October 1917, practically all the political parties of Russia held power, but only the Bolsheviks retained it. Why? With the downfall of the autocracy, a giant popular wave rose up, inspired by that delightful word 'freedom'. And each party, on coming to the forefront, wanted to take command of that wave by barring the way to it. Only the Bolsheviks were able to be not in its way but together -- they moved forward together with the people.

"So today the Party is with the people -- that is what constitutes its wisdom. It asserts that the re-construction means reliance on the living creativity of the masses, all-round promotion of democracy and socialist self-government, encouragement of initiative and independent action, more openness, criticism and self-criticism in every sphere of society's life; it means high esteem for the value and dignity of the individual. Here is the opportunity which is mentioned in the paper. The historical chance which we have no right to miss.

"Foreign correspondents often call in to the MOSCOW NEWS office. One of them asked the other day: 'You often write opponents of the reconstruction -- but what are they like? Show me just one.' I showed him this letter. He read it and nodded his head. He understood."

BURLATSKIY DISCUSSES 'PERESTROYKA,' 'GLASNOST'

PM091155 London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 6 Feb 87 pp 34, 35

[Interview with Fedor Burlatskiy, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political commentator, by Kamaran Qurrah Daghi in Moscow; date not given; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] "Perestroyka" and "glasnost" are two Russian words that have become the distinguishing mark of Mikhail Gorbachev's leadership. The first literally means "restructuring," the term officially used to describe reform and innovation on the economic, social, and soviet levels in the Soviet Union. The exact meaning of the second is "frankness" or "openness," that is the concept of openness which the Soviet leader is urging as a principle to be adopted in informing public opinion about the good things and the bad things in the country's life."

And because every era has its own men, AL-HAWADITH met with one of the men of Gorbachev's era well known in Moscow to get him to talk to us about this "perestroyka" which currently is preoccupying the Soviets and dominating their world.

Fedor Burlatskiy is regarded as one of the most prominent advocates and publicists of Gorbachev's new ideas. He is an eminent playwright, head of the philosophy department at the CPSU Social Sciences Academy, deputy chairman of the Soviet Political Science Association, and political commentator of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, the central paper of the Union of Soviet Writers, in which he publishes his articles and other works advocating change. And because Burltaskiy writes the Soviet leader's speeches from time to time and because he is Raisa Gorbachev's colleague in the teaching profession, he is considered to be a friend of the number one Soviet family. Writing the leader's speeches is a profession which Burlatskiy has mastered since he worked as adviser to former leader Nikita Khrushchev and his speech writer, a position which he abandoned after Lenonid Brezhnev assumed the leadership. First he went to work with PRAVDA and then with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, which is known for its open-minded ideas and stands and its daring in dealing with negative phenomena in society. In addition to that he has taught philosophy and gradually advanced academically until he obtained the title of professor and was appointed head of the philosophy department. [passage omitted]

The dialogue with Fedor Burlatskiy began with the following question:

[Daghi] Will you talk to us about "perestroyka" in the language of openness, "glasnost"?

[Burlatskiy] First, with regard to "perestroyka," I consider that the more weighty and more realistic fact is openness, "glasnost," and the new role of public opinion, which is having an increasing effect on the country's life and even on decisionmaking. Perhaps the tangible impact this has had appeared in particular in the publication of a number of literary and artistic works that dealt with urgent and painful issues in our social life that could not appear previously. For example, "Sad Detective Story" by Viktor Astafyev; "The Fire" by Valentin Rasputin; the novel "Blakha" by Chingiz Aytmatov; and the sensational work by Anatoliy Ribakov "The Sons of Arbat," which deals with the murder of Kirov, a painful event in the history of the Soviet state. [passage omitted on details of Kirov's murder] All these literary works of varying content and artistic level incite wide and heated debate. But each of them embodies a strong impetus to study some of the urgent problems, such as alcohol addiction, the increase in crime, and the use of drugs, subjects which hitherto were considered taboo. Developments also are taking place on this level in cinema work; about 10 films previously shelved by the censor have been screened. One of the most controversial among these films is "Repentance," which deals with the issue of terror in our society and the moral responsibility for practising it in a well-known period of our contemporary history.

It must be realized, though, that the practice of openness has not affected only the cinema and the press, since this is merely what we see on the surface, reflected in the public media. In addition, it has spread and been reflected in the life and activity of our social institutions, primarily party organizations, the trade unions, and to a lesser extent, youth organizations -- the Komsomol. In other words openness has become a valuable social phenomenon on all levels, not only from the viewpoint of informing the public of decisions, facts, problems, and shortcomings but also in terms of this openness becoming a means of public influence on making social, economic, and political decisions. Take, for example, the CPSU and government decision to rescind the previous decision on the project to change the course of Siberian rivers. This happened under direct and clear pressure from public opinion, particularly the writers Astafyev, Rasputin, and Zalygin, all of whom came from Siberia, who fought hard for the cancellation of the previous government decision. I can say that all these things can be regarded merely as the beginning of spreading democratization, which is the long march about which Mikhail Gorbachev spoke during his recent inspection visit to Stavropol Kray.

As for the other aspects of this process, they are those concerned with the work of the party, trade union, and soviet (elected bodies) *organizations*, that is, by stimulating their activities in all directions. The most important thing happening at the level of the soviets, for example, is the expansion of their resources and financial perogatives. These councils have begun to receive about 10 percent of the profits not only of the economic institutions belonging to their district but of central institutions as well, which strengthens their budgets and enables them to improve the transport, housing, and services sector. I believe that the coming stage for the spread of democracy within the soviets will be linked to solving at least two problems: Tightening control on the executive bodies -- provided that this is not confined to the council' sessions, which do not exceed a few days a year -- but also extends to the permanent committees that come under the councils. These committees have actually begun their work and have been summoning to their meetings representatives of the executive bodies in order to make them account for the activities of those bodies and have been making binding decisions with regard to the working cadres. This aspect also concerns the question of expanding the sessions of the councils, which at present meet for a short period of time that does not enable them to deal adequately and in depth with the problems put before them. The necessary decisions to deal with these two aspects will be made shortly.

The second problem of particular importance is summed up in the fact that the direction of the course for the spread of democracy is dependent upon the achievement of economic reforms. The objective of these reforms is to achieve the independence of economic institutions and transform them into the state known as self-capitalization and self-financing; that is the principle of determining the volume of wages by the volume of work. The principle part will remain at the disposal of the institutions concerned while another part will go to the center and the last part will go to the local soviets. This major reorganization of the entire economic system is coupled with the growth of self-management. At present a search is being made for a model that would make it possible to solve two problems simultaneously: On the one hand, keeping independent practical activity in the hands of the institution concerned and on the other, developing production and dealing with the social aspects such as questions of wages, industrial safety, leisure time, and so on.

[Daghi] Extensive complaints are being voiced in the Soviet press, in particular, and even by Mikhail Gorbachev himself about the resistance shown by bureaucratic organs to the process of change. What is the actual extent of such resistance?

[Burlatskiy] Any reform of a structural nature is a difficult matter, be it under a socialist or capitalist regime. When Franklin Roosevelt launched his reforms, which were not of a structural nature but only confined to changing economic policy, he met with stiff resistance. Mitterrand tried to introduce some economic reforms of a structural nature but met with such strong resistance that it reduced the importance of those reforms almost to nil. The reform process in our country is meeting with quite serious resistance. What are the sources of this resistance?

First, the so-called traditional forces. This concerns us all, from the simple farmer to the political leadership in our country. For this reason we find that Gorbachev is constantly talking about the psychological "perestroyka" of every individual. We all have become accustomed to a certain system to which everyone of us became adapted within the framework of this system. Therefore, change before anything else requires a new, innovative look at things. It requires daring, risk, personal initiative, and responsibility. All these are qualitative characteristics that we will not acquire without great difficulties.

Second: The basic resistance is shown by officials of the administrative organs, particularly within the government framework. Obviously, this is because they have to give up a great deal in the way of privileges, powers, and authority in favor of other quarters and lower echelons of administrative circles. For some reason nobody wants to give up his powers willingly, not even in a socialist system. We must add to this the fact that reform affects personal interests, as well, in that the wage system, for example, will be determined on the basis of results and not merely on the occupation of a certain position or post and regardless of whether the person concerned is a minister, a factory manager, or a kolkhoz chairman. This does not concern financial rewards alone, but also includes influence, moral encouragement, promotion, and so on.

[Daghi] What form does the resistance take?

[Burlatskiy] Generally, the resistance is of a negative character, in that it is seldom that anyone resorts to active confrontation, which is an unusual method in our system. But no one denies the seriousness and gravity of such resistance, which creates great difficulties not only for decisionmaking at the leadership level but also for implementing decisions at the ministerial and departmental levels. It is no secret that many of the decisions adopted by the leadership are reduced by the executive departments to almost zero. No sooner do these organs begin issuing instructions for a certain decision than things revert to their previous state. Sometimes the organs lay down certain conditions in order to implement a decision which divest it of any positive effect.

Therefore, the hope for deepening the reform process depends primarily on the political will at the leadership level. Therefore, the activity of Mikhail Gorbachev and the Politburo members in this regard is considered a fundamental factor in ensuring that the wheel of reform will not stop halfway, as it did after Stalin's death, for example. Finally, it must be stressed that there is mutual interaction between economic reform and democractic transformation.

[Daghi] Do you not think that there is an unconscious resistance which society as a whole is demonstrating because of fear and apprehension due to the bitter experiments and the disappointments and frustration of the past following the abandonment of the reforms initiated by Khrushchev after the death of Stalin?

[Burlatskiy] More than anything else this depends on the visualization associated with human awareness. I have written a book about Niccolo Machiavelli, who was a penetrating scientist in political psychology. I recall one of his most intelligent remarks: "The great majority of the people fear innovation more than anything else because this majority do not hope to obtain any benefits from innovation and at the same time are afraid to lose what they already have." Although centuries have passed since the era of Machiavelli, that remark still contains a great deal of truth. Consequently, many people are wary of innovation out of fear that it might disrupt their customary lifestyle and require them to exert efforts of which they are incapable, something that would expose their positions to danger. But on a relative level, no one has followed up the subject because we lack the method of polling public opinion. If we had this method we would be able to say that such a percentage of people is for and such a percentage is against, while such a percentage is fluctuating between the two stands.

But I believe that those who support innovation are the more effective section of society. This section, as is always known, initially represents a minority but its enthusiasm is gradually transferred to the other sections of society. [paragraph continues]

I say again that man by nature likes to learn from personal experience, which gradually accumulates with the practical implementation of the new social and economic changes.

[Daghi] If we go back to your dialogue "Conversation Without Equivocation," we find that it ends with a statement by the old party secretary smacking of defiance. What danger could such party leaders pose after they lose their positions of power?

[Burlatskiy] The actual danger lies primarily in the problem of cadres; it is the most serious problem. As you know, with the advent of the new leadership the process of changing cadres began. This has, in fact, been done in an effective manner. There is no controversy now over this change. Rather the problem lies in the principles that must be adopted during the selection of the new leaderships. That is, which are the cadres that are capable of carrying out the "perestroyka"? What is required is efficient people who are enthusastic about implementing new ideas, are courageous and responsible in making decisions, and have other such characteristtics. This is the most difficult aspect of the change because it affects particular leaders and officials who among them share a common destiny. This was my motive for writing "Conversation Without Equivocation."

The other danger concerns a problem from which other socialist countries suffered when carrying out reforms. It is specifically the problem of specifying the critical and very difficult transitional period. For exmaple, this concerns the problem of increasing prices. Our prices now are not representative. The production cost is not equal to the sale price and foodstuffs are sold cheaper than their production cost, while the price of consumer goods is mostly much higher than their production cost. If we compare matters with what happened in the other countries, an increase in food prices could lead to painful disturbances because this matter concerns every family and the budget of every individual. In the end, naturally, everyone will be compensated in different forms but the interim period of price changes certainly will be painful. The danger lies in that the enemies of reform might exploit the problems relating to price increases in order to attack reform and innovation generally on the grounds that price increases are not confined only to vodka and other liquors but are also affecting bread and other basic food commodities. This problem is now being studied by our economists and I personally am inclined toward the need to not rush into things. First, some forms of compensation must be found for people on low incomes and for pensioners. Otherwise there will be social tensions. But whatever the cost may be, the transitional period is always linked to dangers.

This is to say nothing about the fact that "perestroyka" itself is very complicated. It is difficult in the first place to predict the problems this process will create during its application. At a certain stage the principles of strict financing of materials and their sale on the one hand and their exchange between economic establishments in a relatively nonrestricted manner on the other will continue to be jointly applied. Once again, it is difficult to predict the impact the application of new reforms and innovations will have.

There remains the question of the ultimate objectives of "perestroyka." These objectives will be defined in the course of application. It is difficult to say now to what extent planning and the laws of the market will prove compatible, which means that the objectives are subject to adjustment during application, which in itself is yet another major problem.

Nor do we deny the fact that a large portion of the problem is linked to the difficulties created by the West's refusal to halt the arms race. [paragraph continues]

It must be admitted that our efforts to reduce arms do not concern the question of security alone; indeed, they concern our endeavors to divert arms expenditures to the achievement of economic reforms.

Finally, I must point to a particular problem that the outside world does not see clearly. It is the question of nationality. We are a country with many nationalities. We have several republics, which makes the question of nationality a matter of considerable seriousness for us. This problem is not confined to cadres, culture, and national characteristics. Indeed it goes beyond that to the economic aspect. If we were to apply the criteron "who produces more lives better," this would lead to the standard of living in certain republics becoming very high, while in others becoming very low. We have before us a disturbing experiment in Yugoslavia, where they decided to apply the principle of decentralization. The result has been that the rich republics — such as Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia -- became richer, while conditions in the poor republics — such as Bosnia and Herzegovinia -- became poorer. We are facing this problem, too, and we cannot fail to take it into consideration in our political and national policy.

YAKOVLEV INTERVIEWED BY TRYBUNA LUDU REPORTERS

AU091547 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 5 Feb 87 p 4

[Interview given by Aleksandr Yakovlev, CPSU Politburo candidate member and Central Committee secretary, to TRYBUNA LUDU reporters Zbigniew Lesnikowski and Piotr Rzadca: "Socialism Has Not Stopped Dead in Its Tracks," date and place not given -- first paragraph is editoral introduction]

[Text] Central Committee secretaries of the fraternal parties who are responsible for ideological and international affairs met for a conference in Warsaw several days ago. We asked the participants in this conference to make statements for our daily. Today we publish an interview with Aleksandr Yakovlev, CPSU Politburo candidate member and Central Committee secretary.

[Lesnikowski, Rzadca] Two events of symbolic significance meet this year: The 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, which was a momentous event in mankind's history, and the revolutionary breakthrough in the present life of the Soviet people. This breakthrough was initiated by the 27th CPSU Congress. How would you comment on this symbolic meeting?

[Yakovlev] This is a meeting of heritage and development. This is a dialectical meeting because every step forward reveals new horizons and poses increasingly complicated tasks. This is the road of progress, of socialism. The development of socialist society and socialist man goes hand in hand with increased requirements and the increased significance of social ideals. This is justified by the fact that social progress means, above all, the ennobling of man's soul.

Revolutions are set in motion in the name of social justice. Seventy years ago, Great October created the basic conditions for consolidating this justice: It eliminated exploitation of man by man. All other things depend on us. The strength of true socialism is that it subjects itself to critical reviews during its development.

Seventy years is a long time, which has revealed a great deal of what is basic and permanent and of what is transitory. In particular, what came to the fore was the temptation to be satisfied with what had been achieved and to decide that everything had been done. However, time has demonstrated that succumbing to such a temptation means retreating from what has been achieved. No man who respects himself and his work can come to terms with such a prospect.

[Yakovlev continues] What then is the revolutionary -- this is the adjective we use -- transformation that has begun in the USSR's life in line with the resolutions adopted by the Central Committee plenum in April 1985 and by the 27th CPSU Congress? This transformation's primary meaning is that the realistic proposition that our achievements are really enormous, but can be even greater, continues to gain strength in people's awareness. And the most important thing: That which was good yesterday and the day before yesterday will not be of use tomorrow. It is necessary to be bold in abandoning that which is obsolete, to search for new roads, and to forge quickly ahead for this reason. It is necessry to renew society and man in the name of the present and the future precisely of man. This is the meaning of our transformation.

Another thing I would like to stress is this:

The further we depart in time from October 1917, the more profoundly we realize the enormous impact of our socialist revolution on the fate of the world. At the same time, I think that our friends and enemies realize the enormous potential significance of the present transformation. Our friends are sincerely pleased with the new horizons of socialism and our enemies are afraid of this prospect and seek to prevent it. At such moments the international significance of past and present events in our country becomes especially tangible. This significance is an important material component part of the present times.

Socialism continues its irrepressible onward march along the road blazed for it by Great October, a road prospects of which were delineated in a far-reaching manner by the creators of Marxism-Leninism.

[Lesnikowski, Rzadca] Polish readers continue to receive much information about the current events in the USSR. This information elicits vital interest. Please highlight the essence of this revolutionary transformation.

[Yakovlev] What is the meaning of this "transformation?"

In the economy, it means that we continue to depart from the obsolete model of exensive development and to create the reliable infrastructure of acceleration, which includes all such elements as analysis of cost effectiveness; fiscal autonomy; new planning and management methods; individual economic activities; development of cooperatives; the optimum relationship between centralization, initiative, and independence; and so on.

In the social field, we want to overcome the former trends toward ignoring this field. All kinds of savings in the field of social affairs are a waste of social resources and a direct reason for inflicting material and moral damage on society.

In the field of politics, we want to end once and for all the stagnation of political forms. We must not allow for conduct in which the failure to appreciate the potential of socialist democracy leads to losing the basic idea that socialism means society with people's rule and self-government.

In the field of theoretical questions, the term transformation means a creative development of social ideas, of awareness of the experience of October 1917, of Leninist theoretical heritage, and of the creative and penetrating interpretation of this heritage against the background of the new tasks now facing Soviet society.

[Yakovlev continues] In the spiritual field, we want to promote the true development of socialist culture as mankind's hope in this area, to promote development of independent elements of culture and the elimination of the practice of administering creative work so that intellectuals were alienated from the party and their contributions to socialist construction were impoverished.

What results have we achieved so far?

The first and most important result has been the nationwide support for our philosophy of transformation and for our specific practical measures. This is a source of the additional conviction that our line is correct and feasible -- a very important thing for the governing party.

The primary expression of this support is the new atmosphere that has taken hold of Soviet society. The distinctive feature of this atmosphere is the critical and creative appraisal of our achievements and the search for a new approach, methods, and solutions in all fields -- from the economy through art. Requirements and discipline have increased, and there is more order in plants, institutions, and official relations.

The second thing I would like to stress is the fact that transformation has straight away moved ahead in practical matters. Actually, what we say is that it has just moved ahead. We could not expect more because of the scale of our country and the complicated nature of our tasks. Taking into account a number of objective conditions -- the difficult beginning of 1986, the hard winter, and overcoming the results of the Chernobyl breakdown -- we can say that the beginnings of our transformation in all fields are not too bad. However, we think that the main tasks are still in front of us.

Aside from various economic measures, we continue to prepare new legal documents, especially those on socialist plans, and to improve socialist society's legal base and the performance of legal bodies.

The third thing: Objective, and material-organizational difficulties -- as well as those connected with people's awareness, interests, and habits -- also have made an appearance. Today it is quite obvious that these problems and difficulties do not exist apart, but are interconnected. The burden of backlogged problems that have not been solved in due time has turned out to be greater than we thought at first. However, aided by critical analyses and the extensive participation of the population, we can see these problems and the ways to solve them much better. We want to achieve progress through critically and genuinely viewing what we did in the past. The purpose of our criticism, which is sharp at times and always candid, is to settle accounts with the past. This is all the more reason why we do not want to diminish socialist achievements in any way. The purpose of our critical stance is creative, and this is the meaning of our basic line.

To us, criticism is a tool that enables us to solve problems and contradictions that come into being today and that no doubt will arise in the future. We are convinced that the reason for difficult phenomena and bulging problems is not criticism and disclosures of shortcomings and errors, but piling up and artificially concealing these shortcomings and errors.

[Lesnikowski, Rzadca] What are the most important lessons that Soviet comrades have drawn from the first 2 years of transformation?

[Yakovlev] The basic lesson is that there is a strict and mutual dependence between the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and the intensification of socialist democracy.

[Yakovlev continues] This lesson has revealed the importance of the working people's direct participation in management, control, the development of democratic institutions, in all sociopolitical processes. This lesson stresed the importance of the political factor represented by openness. We think that all this, first, strengthens the working people's trust in the party and their ties with it, and second, enables the party to rely on their direct participation in transformation, on their responsibility for transformation, and on their initiative, political militancy, and maturity.

We also have come to face the entire force of the issues of the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. The task is complicated enough, especially in a situation in which it is necessary to conduct scientific research toward analyzing the real condition and development of society and toward disclosing crucial phenomena. All this calls for the struggle against dogmatism, which can be viewed only as a different form of revisionist attack against Marxism-Leninism. We know well that theoretical work is closely connected with solving practical tasks. Going too far ahead is just as fatal as ossification and stagnation of thought and action.

[Lesnikowski, Rzadca] What about changes in culture?

[Yakovlev] The principles of democratization, elimination of management by decree, and openness help us to greatly strengthen the position and authority of the party in this important sector of social life. We see the meaning of work in efforts to ensure that the entire potential of talents, great national riches, and social riches is of maximum advantage to the people. We do not see the meaning of work in prohibitions and restrictions. Lenin said that talents are rare. However, talent also possesses unique individuality. That is why we try to work with specific people and not with a "mass of workers." We try to trust specific people's experience, decisions, and fine intuition. We have not been wrong in this approach. The party's relations with the creative intelligentsia continue to experience a rebirth. We are pleased that the intelligentsia supports the party's line of transformation and moral renewal and takes an active part in this. The Soviet intelligentsia's aspirations are full of socialist ideals.

Our approach also includes our irreconcilable stance vis-a-vis the penetration of Western, especially American, "mass culture," which is the most dangerous ideological subversion. We view the struggle against "mass culture" as the struggle for man and his rich internal world and to preserve civilization and civilized conduct.

[Lesnikowski, Rzadca] This struggle has many aspects, and all our countries continue to wage it, propagating the ideas of socialism in the world....

[Yakovalev] Yes, because our ideas and principles are important for all mankind. Socialism is the real alternative to the road into which capitalism tries to push mankind. This is because today mankind faces global problems that must be solved globally.

Some of the future problems include overpopulation, shortage of resources, disintegration of the ecology, food crisis, and so on.

Socialism's response is this: In the interest of all nations and working people, the earth needs a different kind of economic management. This is no theoretical concept, because the socialist countries have solved many problems with which capitalism is unable to cope.

[Yakovlev continues] The most crucial question is: Will mankind survive? Imperialism has brought the world to the brink of a nuclear chasm and continues to push it closer and closer, producing ever newer weapons. Socialism seeks to stop the world from continually sliding along this inclining slope.

Mankind's spiritual image? It is enough to ask: Where is it that racism, nationalism, hostility, and hatred thrive? Who continues to besot people with "mass culture"? Who is it that turns morality, ethics, love, and all human sentiments into objects of consumption and trade?

Our conclusion is: It is not only and not simply its values that socialism continues to defend. If it did only this it would not be crucially different from other societies and civilizations. Socialism continues to defend the values of all mankind, whatever is the basis of humanism, and whatever gave rise to civilizatiion.

In this connection, socialism does not regard itself as a monopolist in determining and defending these values. We are ready to cooperate with anyone who wants peace and progress.

CHIEF EDITOR AFANASYEV DESCRIBES PRAVDA OPERATIONS

PM040957 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 30 Jan 87 p 11

[Interview with PRAVDA Chief Editor Viktor Afanasyev by Harald Hamrin: "Now We Too Write About Natural Disasters" in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow — "For a while now the Soviet Union also has been affected by natural disasters," Viktor Afanasyev said with an amused smile. "It will remain so in the future. And we will write about them."

In the past, natural catastrophes such as earthquakes and floods have, as is well known, only affected capitalist-ruled countries. There have not been any Soviet catastrophes, judging from the country's own press. However, for the past year or so this taboo has been broken.

"We, too, are now being hit by natural disasters," Viktor Afanaksyev said. "Now we are writing about them. And we will continue to do so in the future."

Viktor Afanasyev is chief editor of Soviet party organ PRAVDA. In this role he is also, ex officio as it were, a member of the CPSU Central Committee -- in other words, a journalist and a politician in one and the same person.

He received me in his gigantic office, as big as the whole of the DAGENS NYHETER central editorial offices, on the top floor of the paper's building in central Moscow. His desk stands in the far corner under a portrait of Vladimir Lenin.

It was Lenin who once spoke of the press as the working class' agitator, propagandist, and organizer. I asked Afanasyev if he did not see a conflict in the fact that his newspaper must both present the "truth" (pravda) and act as an agitator for the ruling Communist Party.

"No," he said. "There can be no conflict here. And if something really moves in the direction of a conflict, then we seek to find a solution. We decide whether something should be printed or not. We are a party newspaper."

At another point in our conversation he said that the Communist Party "is responsible for everything" in the Soviet Union, for the economy, politics, art, sport, and literature.

"That is why our newspaper is also responsible for everything," he said.

In other words, PRAVDA is an institution in the Soviet Union, one of the foundations on which Soviet society rests, a "national standard" against which all other newspapers in the country measure themselves.

That is why at the party congress almost a year ago, more than one eyebrow was raised when no less a person than Yegor Ligachev, the party's "number two," criticized PRAVDA by name for being guilty of overstepping the mark. The press had played an important and positive role in the debate prior to the congress, Ligachev declared from the congress podium.

"But unfortunately, individual newspapers have been guilty of mistakes and even the editorial staff of PRAVDA has not avoided such mistakes," he said.

On the congress podium Ligachev did not actually reveal to what he was referring. But Afanasyev confirmed what everyone suspected: PRAVDA had made the injurious "mistake" a few weeks prior to the party congress, when the paper published a number of readers' letters attacking the privileges of the elite. To cap it all, the editorial staff in a headline had called for a "purge" in the party.

"Perhaps everything was not entirely successful editorially," Afanasyev said. "But I would publish the same material over again today. And I would like to stress that no one was fired or punished in any other way for this incident."

As in many other Soviet newspapers, readers' letters are one of the most important elements in PRAVDA and keep a whole editorial department busy. The letters have to be read and assessed, replies have to be written, a selection must be made for publication, and many letters also provide ideas for reports.

"We get between 500,000 and 600,000 readers' letters each year," Afanasyev told me. "This means an increase of 100,000 in the last year alone."

The readers write about everyday problems, Afanasyev said -- about kindergartens and nurseries, schools, housing, social and general human problems, economic questions, and about "socialist democracy." The major international questions -- the nuclear arms race and disarmament endeavors -- crop up more seldom.

"That is something for the leadership," people reason, according to Afanasyev.

Today there is also great pressure from authors, artists, and intellectuals to be allowed to contribute to PRAVDA's columns, Afanasyev said. In actual fact, the newspaper's own staff produces about 40 percent of the text published in PRAVDA. The rest is only readers' letters and other contributions from outsiders.

"This is due to the political situation in the country today, to changes in society," Afanasyev said. "And our most important task today is to support this process, not simply to criticize the old, but also to support the new."

The PRAVDA chief editor said that his newspaper has great freedom in this role. He is not subjected to any censor, anyone to check on his work.

"But the Communist Party's general secretary shows great interest in our work," Afanasyev admitted. "He leads our work indirectly."

"Investigative journalism" has become an important task for PRAVDA recently, Afanasyev said. Greater "openness" -- or "glasnost": to use the fashionable Russian word -- is one of the central elements of the Gorbachev regime's perestroyka, or "restructuring," of Soviet society. Corruption in its different forms must be uncovered and hounded, but so must be ordinary "honest" but bad decisions.

As an example of the latter Afanasyev mentioned a campaign by PRAVDA to save the unique Lake Baykal from pollution and ruthless exploitation. This campaign has resulted in the appointment of a commission under the leadership of top planning chief Nikolay Talyzin to investigate how the future industrialization of the area around Lake Baykal is to be carried out.

He also could have pointed to what is, in the Soviet context, a completely unique example of "investigative journalism," which led to the dismissal of a KGB official who misused the "secret" police's power to persecute a troublesome journalist in Voroshilovgrad, in the Ukraine.

PRAVDA was founded by Lenin in 1912 and since then has functioned as the Communist Party's official mouthpiece. Today it has a print run of 11.5 million copies, of which 10 million are subscription copies.

The newspaper is sold every morning throughout the country. Because the Soviet Union stretches over 11 time zones the paper is forced to print in two main editions, an early edition for the eastern parts of the country and a later edition for the western.

Printing itself takes places in no less than 58 locations spread throughout the country. Finished pages are transmitted from Moscow by satellite. Less than one-quarter of copies -- around 2.5 million -- are printed in Moscow.

PRAVDA's staff consists of 450 journalists, of whom 50 are based abroad and 60 at various locations around the Soviet Union.

The newspaper's clear profits -- "quite large profits," Afanasyev said -- go straight into the party coffers.

NIKONOV ADDRESSES MEETING OF KIROV VOTERS

PM091051 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Feb 87 First Edition p 2

[TASS special correspondent report: "Restructuring in Breadth and Depth"]

[Text] Kirov, 3 Feb -- The restructuring of our society is proceeding right across the whole front. It is acquiring a new quality, is developing not only in breadth but also in depth, and is reaching the deepest layers.

Participants in a meeting held today between voters of the Kirovskiy Electoral Okrug and Viktor Petrovich Nikonov, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke about the ardent approval and support of the Communists and the entire Soviet people for the party's Leninist domestic and foreign policy and the restructuring which has begun.

Speakers at the meeting -- including V.G. Poroshin, electric engine driver at the Kirov Station locomotive depot; P.N. Kozhemyanin, machine operator on the Kirovets Sovkhoz; I.L. Fetinina, student at the Kirov Agricultural Institute; V.M. Novikov, chairman of the Kirovagropromstroy Tuzhinskaya MPMK [expansion unknown] and others -- emphasized that the oblast's workers are fully determined to increase their contribution to the further development of the Soviet economy on the basis of the steady enhancement of the role of intensive factors and a resolute focus on science with the aim of achieving the highest possible end results.

The oblast's labor collectives, the speakers said, are participating on a broad scale in the patriotic movement for the successful fulfillment of the plans of the 12th 5-Year Plan and are fully determined to greet the 70th anniversary of Great October in a worthy fashion.

Emphasis was placed on the need to consistently implement the principles of social justice -- unity between words and actions and between rights and obligations, the glorification of honest, high quality labor, and energetic efforts to rid society of distortions of socialist morality.

The meeting was addressed by V.P. Nikonov. He said:

Restructuring and the acceleration of socioeconomic development are revolutionary measures. We have no alternative. Retreat is impossible; there is nowhere to retreat. After hearing and discussing Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's report, the CPSU Central Committee January plenum fully approved the political and practical conclusions drawn by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the basis of the analysis of the situation that prevailed in society during the period preceding the Central Committee April (1985) plenum and endorsed the principled assessment of the progress of restructuring, the first results of the implementation of the decisions of the 27th party congress, and the current CPSU cadre policy tasks formulated by the Central Committee Politburo which will have to be implemented by all party, state, and public organizations. We must implement the course of the Central Committee April plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress consistently and unswervingly and must advance and lead society to a qualitatively higher level of development.

The results of the fulfillment of the plan for the first year of the 5-year plan bear out that the measures being implemented by the party are producing positive results. Annual national income has increased by 4.1 percent against the 3.9 percent envisaged by the plan and against the average annual increase of 3.6 percent achieved during the 11th 5-Year Plan. The increase in industrial output totaled 4.9 percent, which is one-third more than the average annual increase achieved in the 11th 5-Year Plan.

The situation in the agrarian sector also is improving. Compared with the average annual indicators of the last 5-year plan, grain production in 1986 increased by almost 30 million metric tons or 17 percent. The production of potatoes, sugar beets, meat, milk, and eggs also has increased. It must be said that as regards the production of such crops as vegetables, fruit, sunflowers, and cotton, there has been either an insignificant increase or their production has remained at the same level.

The 1987 plan allocates about R56 billion of capital investments for the development of the agro-industrial complex. The task consists of achieving a substantial increase in the effectiveness of the work in all its sectors and improving food supplies to the population on this basis.

Kirov Oblast agro-industrial enterprise workers are faced with great tasks in 1987. In order to meet the 12th 5-Year Plan indicators it is necessary to ensure an annual increase in the production of grain by 8 percent, of potatoes by 9 percent, of flax by 16 percent, and of meat, livestock, and poultry by 7 percent over and above the average annual level achieved during the 1981-1985 period.

This is not an easy task. The results of last year's work will have to be critically and thoroughly analyzed in labor collectives and at the upcoming kolkhoz meetings, and attention will have to be focused on priority questions, taking care to prevent the dissipation of capital investments and material resources.

The problem of consistently enhancing the productivity and stability of crop farming is a priority task of the oblast party organization and of all soviet and agricultural organs.

The standard of land cultivation remains low, and scientifically based farming systems have still not been introduced on 40 percent of farms. Due attention is not being paid to enhancing soil fertility and not enough organic manure is being used. Existing resources and local potential must be exploited more fully in working the soil. Can it be right that, despite the oblast's calcareous raw material reserves, one-third of the liming materials used on farms are imported from elsewhere? And another point: Local reserves of peat suitable for agricultural use total around 300 million metric tons, yet peat procurement plans are not fulfilled year after year and the average annual volumes of peat used for agricultural purposes are declining.

On many farms the deadlines for the completion of sowing and harvest work are not met. Therefore, it is no accident that the key problem in implementing the Food Program -- grain production -- has not been resolved in a satisfactory manner in the oblast. Oblast kolkhoz and sovkhoz yields of potatoes and vegetables also remain extremely low and the cultivation of flax has been neglected. The acreage sown with flax has decreased and the yields of flax fibre and seed are low. Year after year, the plans for the procurement of flax are not met. At the same time, there are quite a few people in the oblast who manage to grow excellent flax crops irrespective of weather conditions. Unfortunately, their experience is not being disseminated.

The key to the development of crop farming is the introduction of intensive techniques in the cultivation and harvesting of agricultural crops. Farm and agro-industrial association managers and specialists must tackle in a more resolute fashion the cultivation of flax, potatoes, vegetables, feed-root and other crops by means of progressive techniques.

Last year positive trends emerged in livestock raising. Production and procurement volumes increased slightly and the plans for the sale of the main types of products to the state were fulfilled. However, the development of the sector cannot be rated as satisfactory. There are still very many shortcomings in this sphere. For one thing, there is a weak feed base, and for another, there are omissions in the reproduction of the herd and the introduction of intensive techniques, as well as a poor standard of veterinary work.

There are 4 hectares of agricultural land per head of livestock in the oblast, of which about 3 hectares are arable land. Yet the livestock on many farms is half-starved. Only 12-16 quintals of feed units per head of livestock are laid in for the winter period and two-thirds of this amount is of low quality. Feed production is lagging considerably behind the needs of livestock raising. Progressive techniques are not being applied in this area as necessary, not enough is being done to improve labor organization, and the consolidation of the material base is proceeding too slowly. More than 50 percent of farms lack standard-design feed shops and only 47 percent of the capacity of existing shops is utilized.

All these shortcomings indicate that many party raykoms and gorkoms, primary party organizations, and farm and agro-industrial association managers and specialists have not yet succeeded in introducing intensive methods in to the management of the sector, establishing elementary order at livestock units, or forming and training skilled collectives of livestock workers.

Despite livestock unit cadre shortages, not enough attention is being paid to improving the livestock breeders' working and living conditions. Work to comprehensively mechanize livestock units and to introduce improved techniques and production organization is proceeding very slowly on farms. The level of comprehensive mechanization of livestock units does not exceed 50-55 percent. Only one-fourth unit collectives use the collective contract. Work in two shifts at livestock units and the flowline system of milk production have not yet been widely introduced. Redcorners do not exist at all livestock units. Only 4 in 100 livestock units have premises where food can be taken and only 1 in 8 livestock units has consumer service facilities.

Party committees and economic managers must switch the focus of all organizational and political work to livestock units and adopt every possible measure to rectify the situation as soon as possible.

Dwelling on questions of the development of the processing and food industry, the speaker emphasized that despite the extremely poor material and technical base of processing enterprises, local party, soviet, and agro-industrial organizations are not paying due attention to questions of capital construction. The plan for construction and installation work on meat and dairy industry projects during the 1981-1985 period was fulfilled only 69 percent. The situation has not changed much in the current 5-year plan; the 1986 plan for the construction and reconstruction of enterprises in this sector was fulfilled 75 percent. Questions relating to the comprehensive processing of raw materials and the utilization of secondary raw material resources, especially whey, are being resolved too slowly.

The speaker devoted much attention to the social development of the countryside. The migration of the rural population has not been stemmed in the oblast. This is largely due to the fact that housing and amenities in rural areas are of a poor standard. Only 40 percent of the housing is provided with running water, only 14 percent with sewerage, and only 4 percent with hot water.

More than 20 percent of kolkhozes and sovkhozes are not connected with administrative centers by hard-surface roads, and as for the interfarm road network, it is one of the poorest in the RSFSR.

Today everyone must grasp that the prevailing pace of the construction of social, service, and cultural facilities, and above all, housing, cannot satisfy anybody. [paragraph continues]

The influx of young people into rural areas can be ensured only by radically changing working conditions and labor organization in the fields and at the livestock units and by doubling and even trebling the volume of the construction of well-appointed housing. And literally everyone has to contribute to the solution of this task. Every enterprise, be it in the city or in the countryside, must make a real contribution to the solution of this problem.

Speaking about questions pertaining to the need to increase labor productivity in the agro-industrial complex on the basis of the introduction of rational forms of labor organization and financial autonomy, V.P. Nikonov said that the recent conference at the CPSU Central Committee emphasized the need to disseminate even more persistently the experience of work gained by leading collectives in the application of financial autonomy and the collective contract which has proved its worth in practice. While assimilating the experience of the best collectives, resolute efforts must be made to avoid formalism, stereotypes, and shortlived campaigns. Irrespective of the cause of these manifestations -- be it managerial incompetence, unwillingness to make the extra effort, or a desire to make a good impression -- they are very detrimental to the cause and they discredit progressive methods of management.

It is necessary to make a critical analysis of the situation concerning the assimilation of economic methods of management on every kolkhoz and sovkhoz and in every labor collective and to define specific measures to ensure the switch everywhere to financial autonomy and the collective contract.

This will make it necessary to considerably raise the standard of party leadership of the agro-industrial complex. Above all, it will be necessary to resolutely give up administration by injunction and other forms and methods of work denounced by the party. The party committee's main lever is cadres. While extensively developing material labor incentives, it is necessary to combine organically them with measures of a moral nature and to enhance the prestige of highly productive labor for the benefit of society in every way.

Attention must now focus on questions of cadre training. This has to be organized in such a way as to ensure that everyone masters to perfection the workings of the economy and comes to understand the factors of the intensification of crop farming and livestock raising and the latest achievements in the food and processing industry. All this ultimately will make it possible to strengthen farms' economies and to scale new heights in labor productivity growth.

The deputy analyzed in detail the progress of the implementation of the okrug voters' instructions relating to the construction of housing, schools, preschool establishments, roads, and trade, consumer service, and health care facilities, all of which is of great importance for the socioeconomic development of the oblast.

In conclusion, V.P. Nikonov expressed confidence that the Kirov Oblast working people would make a worthy contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January plenum and would greet the 70th anniversary of Great October in a worthy fashion.

IZVESTIYA SPOTLIGHTS 'WEB' OF KAZAKH CORRUPTION

PM301645 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by special correspondent Vyacheslav Shchepotkin under the rubric "Cadre Question": "Returning to the Article 'Protection': "Spider's Web"]

[Text] Alma-Ata — People choose their viewpoint depending on what they want to see. Sometimes, despite looking from a mountain top, they seem to see no more than they would from a narrow gorge. Does that mean that their eyesight is poor? Not necessarily. Sometimes it is more convenient to pretend that there is nothing special to see. Each to his own -- it is not important. But what is not seen does not cease to exist. That fact is demonstrated yet again by the assessment of the article "Protection" by readers and officials. But first of all, a brief summary of the theme of the report published last September (See IVESTIYA No 250).

Several years ago the Semipalatinsk branch of the Dzhambul Technological Institute of the Meat and Dairy Industry was changed into an independent higher educational establishment. Oryngaz Rakhyzhanov, an obscure candidate of sciences and head of a small department at the Dzhambul main institute, was appointed rector to fill the vacant post. That was when it all began: The corruption, the nepotism, the bribery, the admission of semiliterates as students, and the recruitment of cadres on the basis of any criteria at all except professional attributes. All these phenomena soon flowered abundantly at the VUZ.

Fortunately there were some people in the collective who immediately began an open struggle against the Rakhyzhanov group. They included Zhenis Kurmanovich Atantayev, head of the Department of CPSU History and Political Economy, and Lyudmila Timofeyevna Tolubayeva, head of the Department of Philosophy and Scientific Communism. With great reluctance the republic's Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education [Minvuz] dismissed the rector. The rescue of Rakhzhanov began immediately, however. With the aid of Kalininskiy Party Raykom and First Secretary Z. Kuzetayev himself, Rakhyzhanov remained in the CPSU. "His people" zealously began finding the "victim" a good job. Meanwhile the threat of dismissal from their posts as department heads hung over Zh. Atantayev and L. Tolubayeva...

Properly speaking, this is where the article "Protection" ended. It evoked a mass of reponses whose writers stridently and unanimously condemned patronage as an antistate and antiparty phenomenon. "The newspaper's readers," writes V. Abramov from Velikiye Luki, who sent the original version of his letter to Alma-Ata and a copy to IZVESTIYA, "expect resolute measures from the republic's Communist Party Central Committee against those responsible for immoral actions and law breaking." This is also the theme of V. Volkov from Sverdlovsk Oblast, T. Kamalov and S. Ikramov from Tashkent, I. Pasko from Baku, A. Zaytsev from Chimkent, Z. Alimbekova from Alma-Ata, and many, many others.

How did the official organs react?

The IZVESTIYA article was examined at the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat and the reply signed by Z. Kamalidenov, secretary of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee, was published in issue 331 for 1986. Replies were also received from P. Savalyev, secretary of Semipalatinsk Party Obkom; K. Naribayev, Kazakh SSR minister of higher and secondary specialized education; A. Vasilyev, party bureau secretary of the Minvuz apparatus; and P. Baymukhanov, chief of the general supervision department of the republic's Public Prosecutor's Office. Thus there was no shortage of replies. But we shall return to their content later.

The readers' harsh assessment of patronage is no coincidence. The fact is that, in view of many people familiar with the situation in Kazakhstan from their own personal experience and from features in the central press, the Semipalatinsk story is by no means an exceptional episode in the republic's life. "This incident embodies a whole phenomenon," Ye. Rayevskiy writes from Novosibirsk; "furthermore, the corruption of social and moral criteria in Kazakhstan is a long-standing phenomenon."

What phenomenon have many Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians, Uighurs, and Germans been talking about with alarm in recent years, not only outside the republic but also and particularly within it? Patronage on a family and clan [rodoplemennaya] basis.

"Until the late sixties and early seventies," the writer Abdizhamil Nurpeisov told me recently in Alma-Ata, "we attached no significance to the clan [rod] to which people belonged. It was mainly old people who remembered their hordes [zhuz] because for Kazakhs the hordes are more of a geographical concept. There are three hordes: the Great Horde, which covers the southern oblasts of the republic, the Middle Horde, in the central part of Kazakhstan, and the Little Horde, in the northwest and west. But there are many clans within a horde. The revolution, the beginning of the building of socialism; the Great Patriotic War, in which I myself fought; and the period of restoration were difficult times. But on the other hand, everyone breathed the pure air of internationalism. People judged one another, not by their clan roots, but by their professional and human qualities. But then everything began to change..."

How that happened is described by V. Golobokov, a former journalist and now a trade union worker, from Amur Oblast. "I was living and working in Chimkent Oblast in southern Kazakhstan at the very time that A. Ramazanov, one of the protagnoists of the 'Protection' article, became first secretary of the party obkom. That was when local favoritism began! Then Askarov, the recently ousted first secretary of Chimkent Party Obkom and a relative of D.A. Kunayev, came to power here. They actually called him "Uly" -- the great one. During those years people often were appointed to posts in south Kazakhstan purely for their clan or national affiliation. It was those clan and family ties that harmed south Kazakhstan's economy and produced fertile soil for the corruption of a great many people."

The process of recruiting cadres, not on the basis of professional qualities, but on the basis of family soon spread to many aspects of life. Furthermore, the higher and secondary specialized education system was among the first to fall under the influence of patronage. This was no coincidence. Apart from the fact that many jobs in this sphere are highly paid, they also provide access to the shaping of future cadres. Is that not why 9 of the 10 rectors of Alma-Ata Vuzes under the jurisdiction of Minister K. Naribayev are representatives of the indigenous nationality? Furthermore, two-thirds of them come from the southern oblasts (whence, incidentally, Naribayav himself and certain other exponents of the Minvuz's cadre policy originate). But there is even more to it than that. Some of them are related to one another and also to people with influence in the republic who have their roots in those same southern oblasts.

There is more to come. Interlinked by regional and family bonds, they have become linked still further by the multitude of services they have done for each other. For example, a stream of complaints about U. Dzholdasbekov, rector of Kazakhstan State University, was sent to all levels, including S. Temirbekov, chief of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Science and Educational Institutions Section. The complaints were "not substantiated," just as the complaints against S. Baybolov, rector of the Architecture and Building Institute, addressed to A. Koychumanov, first secretary of Alma-Ata Party Gorkom, were "covered up." [paragraph continues]

A coincidence? So they say. When U. Dzholdasbekov traveled by plane to defend his higher degree in Tbilisi for some reason, he was accompanied by his old friend S. Temirbekov, and when the latter was dismissed recently he was immediately fixed up at Kazakhstan State University skill improvement institute. And as for S. Baybolov, he was powerfully defended by A. Koychumanov, who someone had rapidly elevated to the post of first secretary of Alma-Ata Party Gorkom. The rector repaid him in like manner. He hired a relative of Koychumanov, even though she was totally unsuited to the institute's needs, and eased his son's passage through the first stages of his scientific career. Then it emerged that the first secretary of the capital's gorkom had a criminal record and had served a sentence, although that fact was concealed. A. Koychumanov was dismissed following the intervention of the central party organs. But S. Baybolov continued to protect his son.

The complaints are also continuing against rectors A. Amirov and N. Momyrov, who are close relatives. The former is head of the Alma-Ata Foreign Languages Teacher Training Institute, the latter is head of the Institute of the National Economy. The atmosphere is unhealthy in both places. At the Institute of the National Economy, for example, dean of faculty A. Abdymanapov was recently convicted of bribery. Furthermore, bribery is on the increase here.

Is that a coincidence too? No, it is a consequence. The threads of patronage are ensnaring new levels, involving new people.

"Not threads," high school worker S. [not further identified] corrected me. "It is a web. They are connected to one another like spiders. Touch one of them and they all begin to stir, and sometimes a blow will come from the most unexpected quarter."

She knows what she is talking about. Here is an example. Not too long ago, after coming across cases of abuse of admission procedure and the transfer of some students from one course to another, N. Fokina, senior lecturer at the Architecture and Building Institute, voiced serious criticism. She subsequently had to put up with a good deal from Alma-Ata militiamen, since one of the students inexplicably at the institute turned out to be Captain M. Kunanbayev, deputy chief of the Department for Combating Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation in Alma-Ata City's Leninskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department. And recently the web struck back. The militia turned up at N. Fokina's apartment and arrested her son-in-law. At the Frunzenskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department he was treated in such a way that he ended up in the hospital. Only this time it did not end with a gentle rap over the knuckles, as had previously happened. The Prosecutor's Office instituted criminal proceedings against S. Dosumov, chief of the Frunzenskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department's Criminal Investigation Section, and another militiaman.

Such cases, once they became known, cast patronage in a very distasteful light. People then began to dress it up here and there in "national garb" to make it look a little more seemly, claiming that most-favored status is accorded all Kazakhs, irrespective of family background or place of origin.

These assurances were far from congruent with reality. And with the advent of certain people to the leadership of higher education the proportion of young Kazakhs in VUZes began to grow sharply, although the indigenous nationality forms less than half of the republic's population. For example, before S. Baybolov became rector of the Architecture and Building Institute, students belonging to the indigenous nationality made up 55-56 percent of those in one course at the Engineering Systems and Structures Faculty. One year later, they constituted 74 percent, and then 78 percent. [paragraph continues]

A similar process took place at the Institute of the National Economy, where at the day section the number of students of Russian nationality fell to 17.8 percent, while the number of Kazakhs rose to 73.7 percent; at the university the figures were respectively 18.8 and 75.8; at the Institute of Agriculture, 10.9 and 79.6; and at the Institute of Veterinary Science, 6.1 and 90.4. And yet Kazakhstan is a multinational republic where there live -- in addition to Kazakhs and Russians -- Germans, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Uighurs, and so forth, which, according to the latest census, make up almost one-fourth of the population. However, for some reason or other, they constitute only 3.5 percent of students at the Institute of Veterinary Science. But the problem is not one of numbers. If young people were admitted as students on ability alone, with the very best of them being chosen, who would pay any heed to the numbers! The problem is a different one. Everyone has seen that "powerful people" have in the main eased the passage of those close to them, primarily pursuing personal, family, and local interests. Out of the great number of examples available we will take the practice at Kazakhstan State University's Faculty of Journalism. Its dean, T. Kozhakeyev, as noted in numerous documents and statements by staffers, turned the faculty into his own fiefdom. Born in Dzhambul Oblast's Merkenskiy Rayon, he surrounded himself with fellow countrymen and devotees who were often poor from a professional standpoint and even semiliterate. Of the 33 lecturers only 7 of Russian nationality remained, and 3 of them were of pensionable age. By choosing lecturers from among his own "kith and kin," the dean also made it possible for them to afford protection to people in need. The result was that the student body was mainly filled with people from the southern oblasts. And again it was not just a question of place of birth but of the kind of people who came to T. Kozhakeyev. They were poorly trained and had neither a gift nor the inclination for the vocation.

Patronage was bestowed increasingly openly and brazenly. More and more people with family, or at least "hometown," ties gathered in the republic capital. And there was nothing the stringpullers would not do for their own people. They provided them with titles, distinctions, and jobs. Thus a chair of the history of party and Soviet journalism was specially created for M. Argynbayev, the discredited director of the Institute of Further Education of the Kazakh State University, despite the fact that there already was a history of journalism chair at the same university. And here is another example. The faculty Komsomol committee twice refused to recommend M. Kuzdibayeva, a student at the Architecture and Building Institute, for party membership, but on both occasions Alma-Ata's Alatauskiy Kazakh Communist Party Raykom interviewed and demanded that she be admitted.

Naturally, all this was covered up with phrases claiming that it was being done "for the good of the people." However, in effect it was for the good of a specific group of people at the expense of others. The same faculty of journalism of the Kazakh State University -- incidentally, the only one of its kind in the republic -- for years admitted virtually no graduates from the republic's central and northern oblasts. In Merkenskiy Rayon, Dzhambul Oblast, the birthplace of the faculty's dean, T. Kozhakeyev, there were 25 people with journalist diplomas without a job, while in northern oblasts less than 14 percent of people working on newspapers had received specialized education. Not until this year and the appointment of the new dean, Professor V. Kozmenko, have graduates from all the republic's 19 oblasts been enrolled at the department.

The same thing was happening at the law faculty, especially in its evening and correspondence course section headed by another of the rector's appointees -- S. Dosymbekov. At present 245 people are enrolled in the first yeat of the correspondence course; 167 of them are Kazakhs, 42 Russians, and 7 Ukrainians. "Why this ratio?" -- I asked the rector, U. Dzholdasbekov. "It is because Russian parents do not regard the legal profession as prestigious, they do not want their sons to become lawyers. On the other hand, any Kazakh father would like his son to become a prosecutor."

You could smile at the academic's interpretation of the "attraction" which the legal profession holds for different nationalities. But it is "explanations" like this one, which "mask the national aspect" of patronage. And the consequences can again be illustrated by facts. Last year the correspondence course section of the law faculty received 2,318 applications of which 1,806 came from graduates living in the 6 southern oblasts and only 470 came from the remaining 13 oblasts of Kazakhstan; 42 applications were received from other republics.

Could it be that young Kazakhs from the greater part of the republic simply do not want to apply to the Kazakh State University? "Quite, they have learned not to," G. Dospulov, lecturer at the faculty's subfaculty of crime detection, told me. "Because they know that their face does not fit."

So this is concern for the Kazakhs' national interests!

"There can be no mention of concern for national interests!" G. Dospulov exclaims indignantly. "Any Kazakh who refuses to take part in their dirty machinations becomes unacceptable. Both I and other communists and nonparty people could cite many such examples. Speaking as a lawyer, I tell you that strict retribution should be exacted for the damage caused, and it is enormous. You tell me, what country, what nation needs illiterate, soulless 'specialists'? The people who train this kind of 'cadre' are inflicting untold damage on their people."

The good-for-nothing "graduates" with diplomas in journalism who cannot find employment in the Merkenskiy Rayon have already been mentioned. Rumor has it that on one Kolkhoz in Chimkent Oblast there are five lawyers. There is not enough work for all of them but they have nowhere to go because no one needs them. No, not because there is a surplus of lawyers. But because the specialists trained by the law faculty are notorious. During the summer examinations last year, for instance, around 200 day-course students received 400 unsatisfactory grades, about 100 of them in three subjects and, in accordance with the instructions of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, they should have been thrown out. However, they were given another chance to "successfully" pass their exams. In the correspondence-course section one in four students is allowed to move on to the next course by prearrangement, despite the fact that he owes work in 4-5 subjects. With the permission of the dean's office, student Altybayev was allowed to retake his psychology exam 10 times(!), and Khaimov, a student in the 6th year of the correspondence-course section, was allowed to retake his examination 8 times.

Examples of this kind could fill this newspaper. Lawyers, doctors, animal specialists, journalists, and meat and dairy industry technologists in name only.... So the article "Protection" did not describe an isolated case but a phenomenon. An alarming phenomenon which, it must be said, was widespread and generally known in the Kazakh SSR and of which the republic leadership was aware. This was reflected in both the criticism of the disproportions in terms of nationalities in the composition of the student body which rang out at the 16th Kazakh Communist Party Congress, and in the dismissals of a number of the most odious figures in science and higher education which became necessary under the impact of the changes taking place in the country.

But beyond this, unfortunately, everything that was done in Alma-Ata was done in accordance with the firmly established method here -- that is, without publicity, under the mantle of secrecy. Nothing was said about why S. Temirbekov was removed from his post after the congress. The same applies to T. Kozhakeyev's removal in May. Nothing was said about the offenses for which U. Dzholdasbekov was removed in June. He, himself, recently told me with indignation: I have no idea why they removed me. "They were all relieved of their posts on the quiet; the orders were read out within a narrow circle," Yu. Malakhov, a lecturer at the Kazakh Polytechnical Institute, told me. "No one briefed the collectives. The most incredible rumors circulated in the city. The people in question retained their chairs at the VUZes, and and this gave rise to new questions: How can he retain his chair if he cannot retain the post of rector?"

This practice indicated that by no means all people were prepared to call a spade a spade, to place the accents where they should be, as K. Shoinbekov, a teacher, put it, and to admit that serious political mistakes were made. This was also borne out by the reaction to the IZVESTIYA article. For more than a month the Minvuz remained silent, as if some additional information were needed to add to the dozens of kilograms of documents contained in a case which was lying at the ministry itself. And the republic Prosecutor's Office maintained a silence for exactly the same period of time, to the day, until it finally deigned to answer with a letter signed by a minor official stating that the Semipalatinsk Oblast Prosecutor's Office had initiated criminal proceedings. The Semipalatinsk Party Obkom, in turn, took more than 2 and 1/2 months to examine a case that was known in all its details.

Could this be a coincidence again? Most probably not. It seems that many people wanted the newspaper article to be seen as depicting an isolated, atypical case. Hence also the measures adopted: Z. Kuzetayev, first secretary of Semipalatinsk City's Kalininskiy Party Raykom; Minister K. Naribayev; and B. Mergaliyev, Kazakh Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education chief cadre officer; received a severe reprimand without endorsement of their record card. A number of people were cautioned, and a few were rebuked. Regrettably, a session of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat also treated the affair as an incident rather than a phenomenon. A few months will pass, the penalties will be lifted, and there will be no record of the punishment for connivance at "abuses" and "actions contravening the law," which is how O. Rakhyzhanov's conduct is described in the reply of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee. And it seems quite likely that care would have been taken to shield him from further responsibility, that he probably would have been allowed to lie low until all was forgotten, had not patronage as a phenomenon been highlighted through dramatic events.

It is difficult to believe that no one at all noticed the situation that was developing in Alma-Ata. You would have to be utterly naive to assume that those who enjoyed considerable advantages as a result of patronage would simply give up their privileges and agree to losing their influence, not to mention answering for their actions. And who could they use to defend their selfish interests? Those, who, like themselves, undeservedly occupied places in VUZes or held prestigious posts, those who they had shaped in their own image. Is it surprising then that among the young people who had come out on Brezhnev Square on 17-18 December was the selfsame M. Kuzdibayeva who Alma-Ata City's Alatauskiy Kazakh Communist Party Raykom had helped to get party membership, that there were students from the neglected law faculty, and the ignoramuses from the Architecture and Building, and Veterinary Science Institutes? As was to be expected, a considerable section of the people who were there came from the southern oblasts.

Today, a month later, life in the republic capital follows its normal course. The broken store windows were replaced long ago, and the places where the hooligan crowd [banditstvuyushchaya tolpa] tore out marble slabs in order to smash them and sling the fragments at the defenseless people standing around can no longer be seen. Questions are being asked, both of those who were detained in the square and of those responsible for higher education and, consequently, for the upbringing of young people in recent years.

However, in my view, we should remember and give some thought also to another aspect of this matter. The web of patronage still conceals much that is sinister, and some people, ascribing more influence to these forces than they actually have, are afraid to openly take part in ridding their house of the filth. It was no accident that I had to comply with the urgent appeal of S., the higher education worker mentioned in this article, not to publish her name. She was prepared to make public the details of the story, which I recorded on tape, together with other interviews. But she was afraid to give her name.

This indicates that both hard work and a complex struggle lie ahead. What is needed is persistence and keen political vision in order to discover what is hidden behind the web of patronage and to identify those who to this day would like to play down the scale of what happened in the republic, those who to the last moment dragged their feet over exacting strict party responsibility from O. Rakhyzhanov and his ilk (he was finally expelled from the party on 13 January this year), and, last but not least, who continue to take a conveniently narrow view of reality, as if they were peering out of a narrow gorge, although they are looking down from a mountain top.

MULTI-CANDIDATES ANSWER FOR 'SECRET BALLOTING'

PM101103 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Letter from a war, labor veteran welcoming proposed electoral procedure changes under the general heading "Last Week's Mail"]

[Text] A Reader Suggests: Before Placing the Ballot Sheet in the Ballot Box [subhead]

At the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum the further democratization of all aspects of our life, and changes in the electoral practice in particular, were discussed.

In this context I would like to say the following. It is very important to ensure truly secret balloting. After all, what has been happening up to now? You get your ballot sheet and everyone's eyes are upon you. You take a pencil out of your pocket and everyone knows what you intend to do. Young pioneers, and sometimes even guards, stand by the booth. If you enter the booth it is obvious that you are going to vote against. And so people don't do this and go straight to the ballot box. And the same thing happens at plant trade union or party election conferences. No sooner have you found a corner, and someone is looking over your shoulder. All this is bound to change a lot if we start nominating two or three candidates instead of one. Then it will not be possible to place the ballot sheet in the ballot box without even looking at it. After all, it will be necessary to choose someone, and consequently to cross someone off, to vote "against." This must become common practice.

V. Timofeyev, war and labor veteran,
Novyy settlement,
Nadezhdinskiy rayon,
Maritime Kray.

"UNEXPECTED" VIEWS ON CONSTRUCTION PHONE-IN

LD201544 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 19 January broadcast a 90-minute phone in program entitled "Problems, Search, Solutions", presented by Lev A. Voznesenskiy, Moscow Television political observer, with Yuriy P. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Union Republic State Construction Committee; Valeriy M. Serov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; Aleksandr G. Melnikov, chief of the Construction Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Vladimir I. Reshetilov, USSR minister of construction; and Nikolay I. Travkin, chief of the Mosoblselstroy No 18 trust. The questions were telephoned in by viewers and read by Voznesenskiy.

Voznesenskiy begins by introducing the program and the topic for discussion -- capital construction in the USSR -- and the participants in the program. The video shows a studio set with the participants seated around a table. The studio is flanked by a typing pool with operators taking down the phoned-in questions.

Voznesenskiy goes on to say: "The telephone numbers will be shown to you in a short while. As always, you will be able to dial them in order to reach our studio, and in the meantime I shall say that at present, more than 11 million people are engaged in construction, and that construction accounts for 11 percent of our national income."

In view of the significance attached to construction, Voznesenskiy suggests discussing its strong and weak points. The first two questions, he says, arrived before the program began. The first question is addressed to Batalin and concerns the participation of the Union of Architects in the process of forming design and construction associations. Batalin answers that individual architects do take part in the newly-created associations and perhaps it would be right to enable the Union of Architects to have a say in that matter as well. Melnikov adds that a Central Committee decree on the further development of Soviet architecture and urban construction is now being prepared, and that document is being developed in close cooperation with the Union of Architects.

The second question by the same viewer concerns the decision to postpone the construction of a scientific-cultural center in Pushkino-Gorskiy Rayon, which in his view is incongruous in the year when Pushkin's jubilee is being observed. Reshetilov answers that the decision was taken in May when it was clear that the blueprints would not be ready in time.

The next question, by Andrew Karlovich Kilyatskiy, an engine operator from Leningrad, is: Should criminal proceedings be instituted against leaders who are personally responsible for the bad quality of construction, and is state acceptance to be introduced at enterprises producing construction materials. Melnikov treats the question in general terms of quality, saying that this issue should be resolved locally and that enterprises of the timber and wood-processing industry have already been transferred to state acceptance. The issue of introducing state acceptance at all enterprises producing construction materials is urgent and will be resolved in due course. It is high time to place builders under control, he says. Batalin specifies the matter under discussion by saying that state acceptance is now being introduced at 59 enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials. As for the builders themselves, they have always had to commission the completed facilities, and what is involved there is making that commissioning conform to stricter standards. Serov says that a special body, the State Committee for Monitoring Architecture and Construction Affairs, has been set up for that purpose.

Nikolay Dmitriyevich Burmistrov, a World War II veteran, asks what is the situation with the reconstruction of five-storey residential houses. Batalin replies that the Council of Ministers is now considering that issue. Melnikov adds that the USSR Ministry of Civil Construction has now been also charged with restoration and conservation of historic monuments, for there have been a number of public complaints that insufficient care is being taken of them. He criticizes Reshetilov's attitude to Pushkin's heritage.

Voznesenskiy then says: "I believe that after we have discussed this issue -- and you have in fact dwelt on it twice in the course of our program -- I believe that should somehow help the progress of that cause and resolution of the issue." The dialogue then continues:

[Serov] "This particular event [as heard] is aimed at making things move.

[Voznesenskiy, laughing] "That means that we can be more or less reassured about that monument.

[Melnikov] "That is the only right approach, otherwise we shall always have to defend ourselves.

[Voznesenskiy] "Aleksandr Sergeyevich Semenov, an engineer from Moscow, when we dwelt on that, formulated precisely the question to which you said that that sort of question is bound to arise: In what way will the regulations regarding the preservation of historic buildings be fulfilled when new buildings are erected at the site, for a great number of monuments have been demolished by construction organizations in order to build residential houses in their place? I believe that the role of our public in that respect has now grown so much, and incidentally, the recent program "The 12th Floor" stressed it yet again, that social organizations in cooperation with state bodies, and the public itself at large will now say their weighty word to bring about an optimal combination in resolving the tasks of urban construction, taking into account, of course, the cultural values in which our country is so rich.

[Melnikov] "I think so may words have already been said that all of us realize the need to deal with it. But now it should be resolved on practical level, this should be dwelt with by the public, I repeat, and by local authorities, together with builders, otherwise we shall not go any further than just talking.

[Voznesenskiy] "Aleksandr Grigoryevich, judging from the fact that it is precisely you who said it, the matter after all is going to be placed under control which is strict enough!

[Melnikov] "You know that the party's Central Committee has already adopted a number of documents in respect of those issues: A decision has been taken on Yasnaya Polyana, another has been taken now on the Solovetskiy Islands, a decision has been taken on abandoning the project to divert northern rivers, and yet another decision is being prepared on Baykal -- in short, things are on the move."

The next question, addressed to Travkin, is whether there have been problems with the transfer of the trust's administrative apparatus to collective contracting. Travkin replies positively, saying that those problems were resolved through the introduction of specific output rates for the officials concerned.

A textile worker from Vyshniy Volochek, delegate to the 27th party congress, is curious about how the problem with long-delayed construction reports is being tackled.

In reply, Reshetilov says: "That is the gravest problem today, not only in our ministry but apparently with all builders, the problem of long-delayed projects. One should say that the transfer to self-recouping and self-financing -- and we in our ministry do intend to transfer to self-financing -- is pushing us toward the debtor's prison. We must do away unconditionally with all long-delayed projects over the next 3 years and return to the planned rates of construction. According to our estimates, we need about 4 years to do away with the long-delayed projects. We believe that in the course of 1988 and 1989 we shall put an end to long-delayed projects in our ministry."

Batalin then suggests that the time allotted to the construction of facilities must be halved in order to resolve that problem. The deadline set by the state committee for doing away with long-delayed projects is 5 years, he adds.

Moscow builder Kuznetsov puts a question on low-level planning. Servo answers that planning from below is being considered very seriously this 5-year plan and suggests that Travkin might have a better answer to that question on the example of his trust. The dialogue then continues:

[Travkin] "In my view, planning from below is not an element but the basic part of planning. We are now capable of shaping 80-90 percent of a plan ourselves, but the remaining 10 percent should come down in the form of state or oblast orders -- 10 percent, not more. At the moment, for one reason or another, any transformer station, any shed, which costs R50,000 has to be planned by Gosplan.

[Voznesenskiy] "Well, I believe a shed will cost more -- incidentally, a shed costing R50,000 would be strange.

[Travkin] "Planning from below should no longer be considered as an element. And if we are going to transfer to self-financing at an accelerated rate, let's say, the planning from below will come and will become the norm for all organizations. This is also the answer to the issue of long-delayed projects. Why are they delayed? It is not the fault of the builders. They are delayed because either the customer ordered the construction of an unnecessary facility and then paid no heed to the needs for equipment or whatever else, or that facility was not considered at all in terms of manufacture of this or that product. And the main trouble is that its construction is carried out with someone else's money -- state funds are promptly taken and put in, and there you are, you have got long-delayed projects. When they start building with their own money, there will be no delays anymore.

[Voznesenskiy] "Nikolay Ilich, perhaps you would allow me to correct you a little. You said that the delay in construction is not the builders' fault; perhaps the builders are not the only ones to blame. Perhaps that would be right, because the reasons for delays in construction are not limited to those you have listed.

[Travkin] "Long delays in projects is the fault of the outdated economic system which we are breaking today -- with the help of the Central Committee. It is that system which is to blame, but it is our mutual grievance."

Serov then says that the 1987 plan envisages the provision of R17 billion of the building organizations' own money to finance construction projects. Batalin objects to what Travkin said by arguing that complex and crucial national economy projects still require a great deal of central planning. Serov supports him, saying that all "strategic" areas of construction remain the prerogative of the State Planning Committee.

Natymshchik, student of the Academy of National Economy, asks Travkin about the results on the trust's work in new economic conditions. Travkin replies that it is a bit too early to sum up the results, but so far the developments have been assessed positively. The earned funds are only just being divided.

Voznesenskiy says: "Against the background of first positive results achieved by Trust No 18, the question from Vladislav Nikolayevich Verzhbitskiy, an economist from Moscow, is perhaps especially topical. It is addressed to Yuriy Petrovich: It was to my deep regret that I saw in yesterday's report of the USSR State Statistical Department on performance of the national economy in 1986 that it was the builders who had the lowest plan fulfillment figures -- from 72 percent to a maximum of 94 percent, and that of the complexes and the arrears of individual ministries in plan fulfillment are even greater. Could you, Yuriy Petrovich, explain that phenomenon?

Batalin responds: "That is a very serious question. That is, in fact, the core of the activities of the country's builders. The results on the introduction of facilities is, well, it cannot be regarded as a good result. True, we were supposed to augment the introduction of basic funds last year by 14 percent, and in reality we have only achieved a rate of 6 percent compared with 1986. Naturally, many projects appear not completed. And if one is to examine the report attentively, that situation exists with practically all -- exceptions are rare -- consumers, that is an overall phenomenon. This can be explained and viewed in different ways, but in principle, in order to achieve that high development rate, the rate of introduction of facilities, the final results, a serious range of measures has to be developed. As a matter of fact, we have not been ready for such serious tasks or for tasks on such a large scale this year." However, he says, the new economic mechanism should change it all, and much better results are being expected in 1987. "But I would like to dwell on one thing," he adds, "not as a comfort, but in order to give a more correct assessment of the processes which are taking place. It must be taken into account that over the past 5-year plan, we have augmented the basic funds -- that is, over the 5 years taken together -- by only 16 percent. And here we have got 6 percent over 1 year only. The average rate of introduction of facilities over the 5-year plan years was just 3.1 percent. And taking the last years, 1984 and 1985, our rate of introducing basic funds was just 1.8 percent." But, he concluded, the package of economic innovations which is being introduced gives rise to hope; that package includes bringing down construction costs.

Voznesenskiy reads a question from Moscow builder Stepanov concerning that issue. The question is passed to Reshetilov, who says that one of the ways is the transfer to large-panel construction, as decided today by the ministry. It amounts to economies of 20 percent, but there is a problem he says: loss of material interest by builders who would not be motivated to undertake low-cost and therefore low-profit contracts. Serov cites a few example of construction trusts building with their own money and therefore motivated to build as cheap as possible, namely the so-called Belorussian experiment and its emulators. Melnikov cites a few more.

Voznesenskiy then channels the discussion back to specific questions, reading out a complaint from a viewer who says that the question about reconstruction of five-storey residential houses has not been answered. Batalin quotes the central bodies' decision on reconstruction, dwelling on the increased salaries for workers engaged in those projects. Decisions on the reconstruction of specific areas and houses belonging to specific directorates should be resolved on the level of local soviets.

Batalin then continues: "Incidentally, I can cite an example. When this issue was examined by the Politburo, precisely that question was raised: What should be done with panel houses built in the first years of panel construction. And the answer was that that was precisely the aim of preparing the decision on which I dwelt so expeditiously today." New projects and designs have been offered for the reconstruction of those houses, he adds.

The next question, addressed to Travkin, inquires what kind of difficulties did he encounter when introducing financial autonomy in his trust. Travkin said he believes financial autonomy at team level is nonsense; it can only be effectively introduced at the trust level. Voznesenskiy remarks that he was not expecting to hear something like that for an answer and suggests that Travkin dwell on the correlation between team and collective contracting instead. Melnikov undertakes to answer and says that these two approaches should not be contrasted and that promoting democracy in labor collectives is the most crucial task today. Some economic leaders give up their positions, he said, because they feel unable to cope with collective management.

Batalin disagrees and says that combining team and collective contracting is a serious problem, because the adoption of collective contracting at a large enterprise may result in underrating the role played by individual teams in making contractual decisions. Batalin supports Travkin's view on the expedience of introducing financial autonomy at large-association level, such as the trusts.

Next, Voznesenskiy presents a question from a transport engineer who points out that very often in the construction of capital projects storage and dispatch facilities are simply forgotten. This leads to material losses, environmental pollution, and delayed return of rolling stock. When is an integrated approach to the construction of major production facilities going to be learned, he asks?

Replying, Serov says that in pursuit of immediate results both customers and contractors often produce so-called "trimmed commissioning stage complexes". They believe that capacities which are handed over can produce fast results and that supplementary facilities can be added at a later stage. This, however, frequently contradicts itself and leads to losses instead of gains, Serov says. Now it is clearly stated that no "trimmed commissioning-stage complexes" will be accepted. The phenomenon should be eliminated by 1987, he asserts, above all through the "strength, role, and significance of agreements in capital construction. As from 1987 building organizations will be assessed only on 100 percent fulfillment of agreements. There will be no more important and unimportant, large and small facilities. That is, we have adopted the experience which is today widely used in industry -- all organizations are assessed only on 100 percent fulfillment of agreements." Melnikov adds that another influencing factor will be normative building times. Both customers and contractors will suffer financial penalties for construction projects not completed on time, which was not the case before the introduction of the new economic mechanism.

In response to a question from a Mordovian construction materials organization manager, Reshetnikov acknowledges that the construction materials sector had been neglected land says steps have been taken to improve the situation.

Serov then replies to a question from a farmer regarding the availability of construction materials for kolkhozes which says this is becoming a more widespread phenomenon. "Enterprises and organizations are starting to earn their own money and they want to see quick returns. They want to invest and get results from earned resources," he says. From 1987 all such organizations will be provided by Gossnab with materials in accordance with the same norms as apply to capital construction.

Batalin then proceeds to summarize a lengthy question from a Muscovite who expresses anxiety over the performance of the construction sector, as shown by yesterday's Central Statistical Administration report, and asks whether other indicators, apart from gross product, should not be considered. Batalin says that this year, for the first time for many years, the growth in unfinished building projects has been stopped. The volume of construction work and the volume of commissioned facilities both grew by 6 percent As for the economic mechanism, it could not have had much influence on indicators because it only came into operation at the end of last year.

On the subject of the economic mechanism itself, Batalin says that just like a physical mechanism it will work well provided all of its components work well. "Previously many theoreticians erroneously believed that the introduction of some single indicator, which externally appeared highly-attractive and oriented at the end result, would enable us to achieve a breakthrough in capital construction," he said "These were illusions."

The present economic mechanism, Batalin continues, envisages a "complex of connected, organically-connected measures" which in their entirety can produce and will produce results determined by the main indicator -- commissioned facilities. "But we have to learn to be patient. We always lack, we frequently lack patience. When we introduce some economic mechanism or some management methods we want to have results in a flash. And if things do not work out in a year or a year and a half we start thinking up new things and one layer goes on top of another without the old things having been completed. So, we should learn to be patient. Let the construction workers get on with their work for a few years. But I think that we will not need to wait several years. I think that as early as 1987, and I am deeply convinced of this, we are going to have positive shifts in capital construction in the solution of its main element -- commissioned buildings," Batalin concludes.

Travkin replies in the affirmative to a Moscow lawyer who wants a yes-or-no answer about whether he had ever violated regulations which hinder or obstruct and been punished. No other way was possible, he says. But first the people who drew up the regulations were changed and then the regulations were changed. Melnikov then answers questions from teachers about the construction of new school buildings suitable for the requirements of the educational reform. The volume of school building grew last year and will grow in 1987, he says.

Voznesenskiy then reads a question from a Lithuanian mechanic who asks: "Why are all questions solved only by Muscovites? When will each republic be allowed to build housing according to its own designs?" He is also convinced that there will be no answer.

Melnikov says that the principal element of the restructuring, even looking at a narrow sector like construction, consists in strengthening central leadership with a maximum devolution of powers to the local level, including republican. Construction has been delegated to republican ministries and they have powers to resolve all issues, he says. "It has already been said many times that you don't need to go to Moscow with every question, or to ask it in Moscow, or to try solving it in Moscow." The country is so large and has such greatly varying conditions that issues have to be solved locally. Lithuania has good designers, excellent architects, and should build its own houses Melnikov continues, and so should every oblast and territory.

Batalin interjects to supplement a couple of topics. On the first one he highly commends to everyone the new series of large-slab building elements mentioned earlier by Reshetnikov. He also very highly commends some designs by Lithuanian architects and says that, having been there to see them, he always recommends that people from other parts should go and study Lithuanian experience.

To close the subject Serov adds that all capital investment and construction planning is dealt with by the republics and not by Moscow.

Next Reshetnikov, Melnikov, and Batalin deal with a question concerning the usefulness, or otherwise, of central directorates which come between building trusts and building ministries. While Reshetnikov remains noncommittal, Batalin says that their usefulness depends on local circumstances and volume of work within areas. Melnikov believes it is a question of style of work rather then structures.

Voznesenskiy addresses the next question to Travkin: "Nikolay Ilich, who should stand at the head of labor collectives' councils in mechanized mobile teams of an administration? At present these are invariably the heads of those organizations. But perhaps workers, team leaders, foremen, and heads of sections and departments should, possibly in turn, be entrusted with charing these councils? There would be more democracy and more people who know how to make use of democratic power and how to manage. That was from Sergey Pavlovich Shchetinin, a worker from Kaluga. What is your opinion?"

Travkin replies: "I have an unequivocal opinion on this. A meeting of a labor collective's council is a serious managerial action. One has to prepare for it, one has to know the situation, one has to know and feel the proposed solution, one has to be in charge of the situation. And if we want to play at democracy, lets appoint team leaders and workers as chairmen. But if we really want to attract democracy into management then a leader should be at the head. Which is precisely what we do."

Melnikov qualifies this by saying: "But a democratic leader." This is greeted by several consenting voices and a brief outburst of laughter.

Travkin goes on: "You see, these things have to be taught. We are not going to get it right away. It can't just happen like that: We used to just raise our hands mindlessly and now that we have set up management councils everyone's developed brains. But a management council provides opportunities for learning. It does."

Voznesenskiy says: "Nikolay Ilich, I think that if a man does some active work in such a labor collective's council, even without being its leader, if he is only an ordinary worker or a team leader, and so on, and acquires some managerial experience, there will presumably come a time when you will say: You know, you understand the problems of my collective, so to speak, as well as I do. You are equally literate, you have the same education, the same work experience. That is -- do you understand me -- not being a builder and thus not having, in a sense, equal right to speak in this program, I would nevertheless like to soften somewhat your categorical formulation of this issue. Having dealt for many years with the social side, above all the economic and social side of team contracting, I have seen what positive results at a team level -- I emphasize at a team level, not at a trust level of which you now speak, but a team level -- what positive effect is produced by involving, not just as members of a council but also as council leaders, ordinary workers, workers who take turns, who, indeed, probably give up their private and free time in order to enrich their understanding of their labor collective's matters. That is, I think people should have some prospects for growth, including in the execution of managerial functions within their labor collective. It appears to me that your formulation of the issue is somewhat harsh and I have conceived that if I were a team member and if I had at least a drop of healthy ambition i would have thought: What do I want to go to the council for? I'll be there for the rest of my life. If they elect me..." Travkin interrupts to say: "But they might elect you as head of a trust."

Voznesenskiy responds: "They might. But perhaps if he has learned from the experience of his involvement in the council he will not always formulate the issue so harshly.

"Incidentally, why am I wasting our valuable program time on this question? It is, comrades, a question of principle. It is a question of developing democracy and not just creating appearances of democracy. In management councils or labor collectives' councils at many industrial enterprises, including let's say Avtovaz where this movement began, and a number of other places, there a collective leader -- trade union, party, Komsomol organization leader -- is necessarily a member of that collective but he is not necessarily the leader of that collective. And on the social level this produces specific shifts. That's why it's a good thing that we have heard Nikolay Ilich's point of view, but..."

Travkin interrupts to say: "That's impossible, Lev Aleksandrovich! If the formal leader does not coincide with the informal leader he should be replaced."

"That's true," Voznesenskiy replies, "but it does not mean that the formal leader, especially if he is also the informal leader of his collective, has no need of close contacts and support from new and young forces which are going to acquire managerial experience through working in that council at its various levels and not just at the level of its ordinary members."

Travkin replies "Well, who is stopping that? Who is stopping it? The management council chairman's hand is equivalent to an ordinary member's hand. Each of them has one vote, just one. In a team the team leader knows as much as a worker. But in a sector they are not equivalent. We have already played democracy in [word indistinct] which have not done any work and are still not doing any work. We are still latching onto..."

Melnikov interrupts: "I think that the issue is as follows: The transfer of an enterprise to collective contracting unveils entirely new relations in the labor collective. Entirely different. Not even those that we have had in team contracting or, in general, in the conditions of our whole social life. We have some experience, Nikolay Ilich Travkin. Of some 400 or more trusts only 100 have started it so far, more are planning to do so. That is, we haven't got that much experience of trust collectives. If the experience we have is good, fine, let it operate. If there is new experience, we'll study it. Life will show what kind of things should there be and how they should be."

Travkin then counters:" "It is not a valid comparison between team and collective contracting. In my view, team contracting is a method of work organization, while collective contracting is a relation of production. There is a leap there. Relations of production have changed, while we are still putting them on the same shelf."

Vosnesenskiy interjects: "Nikolay Ilich, now is not the time for discussion. But this is so much a question of principle that I would like to apologize to my esteemed viewers, our esteemed viewers, and I must say that team contracting is not just a method or work organization but also a method of educating a man as a master of his factory and ultimately a master of his country. And this is a method of involving men in the management process. I absolutely agree with you -- it is a different level than collective contracting. Nevertheless, speaking of team contracting, its functions cannot be reduced merely to organization of work and production.

This is greeted by sounds of assent. Voznesenskiy goes on: "I think that the formulation of the issue offered by Aleksandr Grigoryevich, namely thorough study of your experience, collective contracting experience, experience of collective contracting at a level of a major trust, with close study of team contracting wherever it is used, and of collective contracting in other organizations, whether larger or smaller than yours, should all take place. And life itself will settle our unintentional, unexpected, minor, but in my view principled, dispute. When we speak of improving the economic mechanism in construction -- and I don't think any of those present will dispute this point of view -- we are talking not only about creating a mechanism for incentives and a mechanism for improved planning, we are talking also about the creation of a mechanism which will involve enormous masses of direct producers in the real democratic changes that are taking place in our country."

Serov replies: "I would say that in construction the human factor plays a greater role than in any other area of our national economy."

Voznesenskiy says: "Fine. Well, this was probably the first time in the history of our program, and it is now in its 7th year, that such an unexpected discussion has arisen and we shall see how our comrade viewers react to the fact that we have, in a sense, expressed such opposite points of view, or at least points of view not entirely coincidental."

Returning to other questions from listeners, Voznesenskiy passes each participant a batch of questions and invites them to answer briefly two or three of their choices. Batalin answers questions on improvements in surveying, incentives, construction training and negotiated prices which are under discussion. He explains the differences in the status of Gosstroy, which has changed from a normative-formulating body into an organization pursuing productive aims, rejects a suggestion for restricting the range of construction projects, and describes how collective contracting will have to be widely adopted in the construction industry if 1987 targets are to be met.

Next, Serov explains that responsibility for major "ecological, social and technical errors" made in accepted designs rests with the customer ministries who make the designs and how normative construction times should alleviate idiosyncrasies such as commissioning of boiler houses in December.

Next, Travkin briefly answers some questions regarding pay for young specialists. Reshetilov goes on to speak about the availability of allotment homes and, with assistance from Batalin and Melnikov, addresses the introduction of collective contracting in the construction sector.

Finally, Melnikov answers a "standard question" on what are the main building projects of the 5-year plan. He says that the major thrust will be directed at the development of the engineering industry. Other major building sites will be BAM, West Siberia, the Astrakhan complex and projects for the food program. The housing program, which aims to provide a home for every family by the year 2000, should be at the center of attention.

In conclusion Voznesenskiy hopes that construction workers speed up the restructuring in their own industry.

CONTINUING REPORTAGE ON LAUNCH OF SOYUZ TM-2

Cosmonauts Enter Station

LD080150 Moscow TASS in English 0132 GMT 8 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS -- The Soyuz TM-2 spaceship docked with the orbital complex Mir--Progress-27 at 2 hours 28 minutes Moscow time today. Having checked the air-tightness of the docking unit, Spacemen Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin transferred to the station.

The Mir orbital research station has been functioning in the near-earth space since February 20, 1986. Working aboard the station, crews carried out comprehensive tests of structural elements, adjusted the equipment and installed instruments and machinery.

Now that another stage of the operation of the Mir station has begun, the plans are to develop a permanent orbital manned complex with specialized research and utility modules. Romanenko and Laveykin are to carry out an extensive programme of astrophysical, geophysical, technological, medical and biological studies and experiments aboard the complex.

According to telemetry information, the onboard systems of the Mir manned complex, including the base unit and the Soyuz TM-2 and Progress-27 spaceships, are functioning normally.

Romanenko and Leveykin are in good health.

Day Two Aboard

LD091017 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS -- Soviet cosmonauts Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin are in their second day aboard the orbiting station Mir (peace).

They are continuing planned operations to shift the station into the manned flight mode.

Among other things, they have reactivated the life-support and termperature-control systems, test-run the radio and television communications facilities, and checked the condition of other equipment.

As of today, their working day will last from 8 a.m. till 23 [as received] p.m. Moscow time.

According to the cosmonauts' reports and telemetry data, the flight of the orbiting complex is proceeding normally.

The parameters of its orbit are as follows:

maximum distance from earth -- 369 kilometers,
minimum distance -- 328 kilometers,

period of revolution -- 91.4 minutes,
inclination -- 51.6 degrees.

Romanenko and Laveykin are feeling well.

Spacecraft Mission Updated

LD111027 Moscow TASS in English 1014 GMT 11 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 11 TASS -- The space flight of Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin on board the Mir orbital complex is going on.

The cosmonauts have completed the scheduled operations to reactivate the mainframe and began to unload the Progress-27 cargo spacecraft.

They are transferring containers with food, equipment, instruments, and scientific apparatus to the station and are putting them in the assigned places.

An adjustment of the orbit of the space complex was made today by means of the population plant of the cargo spacecraft.

On the strength of the results of radio talk with the crew and medical control data, the progress of Yuriy Romanenko's and Aleksandr Valeykin's adaption to weightless conditions is proceeding normally.

The parameters of the micorclimate in the living compartments of the MIR manned space complex are as follows: temperature -- 22 degrees above zero, centigrade, and atmospheric pressure is 830 mm of the mercury column.

COSMOS-1819 FUNCTIONING 'NORMALLY' 7 FEB

LD908807 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 9 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS -- The Soviet Union on February 7 [as received] launched another satellite in the Cosmos series. Cosmos-1819 is carrying scientific equipment to continue outer space exploration.

It was inserted into an orbiting path with the following parameters:

initial period of revolution -- 88.7 minutes,
maximum distance from earth -- 254 kilometers,
minimum distance -- 197 kilometers,
inclination -- 72.8 degrees

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

ZHOLKVER CONTRASTS U.S.-USSR SPACE PROGRAMS

LD062252 Moscow Domestic Service In Russian 1600 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] In the stormy protests from many countries at the latest nuclear blast in Nevada, this thought is often expressed: Is there really any alternative to the mad arms race? Are we not bearing witness to a certain fatality in the use of the greatest achievements of science and technology for military purposes?

Well, an event has happened which, in my view, graphically demonstrates the huge possibilities of how science can serve the interests of the whole of mankind. The launching of a new space craft has been carried out in our country. This is one more step in the peaceful research of space, its exploration for the good of the people. It is also a new phase in arranging international cooperation in space. Future cosmonauts from Syria who also have the prospect of working on the Mir orbital complex have visited Baykonur.

Let me remind you that your country is sponsoring the creation of a worldwide space organization which would be engaged in implementing large-scale international projects. During his recent visit to India Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed the setting up of an international space center for joint research and the development of space equipment prototypes. I not that such peaceful alternatives to military programs are important not only from the point of view of resolving global problems, truly common to all mankind, but also in an ethical and political context. Peaceful cooperation in space would make it possible to expand knowledge about one another, and about plans and projects, and would thus strengthen mutual trust and help to overcome the mentality that believes in the inevitability of military confrontation.

However, the unceasing nuclear blasts in Nevada demonstrate the Washington Administration's attachment to the old political thinking, counting on force, and striving to smash the military balance that exists in the world. But surely the new space launch from Baykonur is new confirmation of the hopelessness of the U.S. policy of strength. Surely it is clear that a country that can carry out accomplishments in space will be able to take care of its security too. However, we are striving for international cooperation and disarmament to supplant military programs as soon as possible. The world has come to the juncture where a new political thinking is doubly essential, in the interests of the survival of mankind and its progress.

COMMUNICATIONS STATION OPERATES ON SAKHALIN

PM101159 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under general heading "Just a Paragraph"]

[Text] Residents of the village of Viakhtu, one of the most isolated on Sakhalin Island, now receive transmissions of Central Television's First Program. A "Moskva" satellite communications station is now operational here. The collective of the Aleksandrovsk-Sakhalinskiy Rayon Communications Junction have fulfilled an important item of their pledges.